DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 076 801 VT 020 162

TITLE	Maryland Advisory Council on Vocational-Technical Education Third Annual Evaluation Report, 1972.
INSTITUTION	Maryland State Advisory Council on Vocational-Technical Education, Baltimore.
SPONS AGENCY	Bureau of Adult, Vocational, and Technical Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	72
NOTE	82p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Advisory Committees; *Annual Reports; Career Education; Community Involvement; Disadvantaged Youth; Educational Objectives; Educational Planning; Handicapped; Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; *Program Improvement; Research Projects; State Programs; Statewide Planning; *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS	*Maryland

ABSTRACT

In its annual evaluation of the vocational and technical education program of Maryland, the Maryland Advisory Council on Vocational-Technical Education reviewed the State Plan and statistical record of the Division of Vocational Technical Education (DVE) for fiscal year 1972, and conducted interviews with representatives of DVE. Included in this report are the findings from an evaluation of: (1) the State Plan, including an examination of enrollments, program development, community involvement, special programs, post secondary programs, research activities, and inservice activities, (2) effectiveness with which people's needs are being met, including the availability of data for planning purposes, coordination of training opportunities, job placement activities, and provisions for career education, and (3) the extent to which Council recommendations have received consideration. On the basis of its evaluation, the Council recommended that: (1) community involvement in planning and administering local programs be stressed, (2) the State Department of Education give proper emphasis to vocational education research projects, and (3) the State Department of Education set more definite goals for serving the handicapped and disadvantaged. Appendixes include: "Public Attitudes toward Vocational Technical Education in Frederick County;" and "A Study of Career Guidance in Maryland." (SB)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 076801

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

3rd Annual

Evaluation Report

by

Maryland Advisory Council

on

Vocational-Technical Education

1972

VT020162

MARYLAND STATE ADVISORY COUNCIL
ON
VOCATIONAL TECHNICAL EDUCATION

There are twenty-five members of the Advisory Council appointed by the Governor.

The Council members are appointed to satisfy membership categories of Sentate Bill 207, Acts of the 1971 session of the Maryland General Assembly and Public Law 90-576;

The current membership is listed below.

Mr. Kermit A. Cottman
Supervisor of Instruction
Somerset County Board of Education
Princess Anne, Maryland 21853

Mrs. Norma H. Day
Director of Adult Education
Montgomery County Board of Education
850 North Washington Street
Rockville, Maryland 20850

Mr. Edwin Legg
Coordinator of Apprenticeship Training
Ironworkers Local #16
2008 Merritt Avenue
Baltimore, Maryland 21210

Mr. James A. McComas, Jr.
Chief of Business & Industrial Development
Division of Economic Development
State Office Building
Annapolis, Maryland 21404

Mr. Claude O. Merckle - Chairman SAC
President
Danzer Metal Works
P. O. Box 886-2000 York Road
Hagerstown, Maryland 21740

Mr. James G. Nelson
Director, Wye Institute
Cheston-on-Wye
Queenstown, Maryland 21658

Mr. Leonard Rosenberg
President, Chesapeake Life Insurance Company
527 St. Paul Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21202

Mr. Donald Shires
Editor of Cumberland Times
Cumberland, Maryland 21502

Mr. J. Donn Aiken, Director
Maryland State Employment Service
1100 North Eutaw Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21201

Mr. Sidney Chernak
Executive Director
Strauss Foundation
Camp Airy Baltimore Office
5750 Park Heights Avenue
Baltimore, Maryland 21215

Dr. Jean Hebeler
Head, Department of Special Education
University of Maryland
College Park, Maryland 20740

Miss Mary Allen
Associate to the Executive
Director for Governmental Relations
American Vocational Association
1510 "H" Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20005

Mr. Harts M. Brown
Brown and Associates
3701 Bowers Avenue
Baltimore, Maryland 21207

Dr. John L. Carnochan, Jr.
Superintendent of Schools
Frederick County Board of Education
115 E. Church Street
Frederick, Maryland 21701

Dr. Kenneth H. Guy, Jr.
Dean of Community Services
Harford Junior College
Bel Air, Maryland 21014

Mrs. Albert B. James
8013 Jones Road
Jessup, Maryland 20794

Mr. George Lechlider
Farmer - Farm Bureau Official
Gaithersburg, Maryland 20760

Mr. John W. Paul, Jr.
Supervisor of Personnel
Bethlehem Steel Company
Sparrows Point, Maryland 21219

Mr. William A. Welch, Sr.
Executive Director
Southern Maryland Tri-County Community Action Agency
Hartman Building
Hughesville, Maryland 20637

Honorable Elroy G. Boyer
Attorney
107 Court Street
Chestertown, Maryland 21620

Mr. Frederick W. DeJong
Asst. Superintendent for Balto. Public Buildings & Grounds
Room M-6
301 W. Preston Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21201

Mr. Lenwood M. Ivey
Executive Director
Community Action Agency
11 E. Mt. Royal Avenue
Baltimore, Maryland 21202

Mr. Henry B. Kimmey
Manager-Employee Relations
Baltimore Gas & Electric Company
Room 1612
Baltimore, Maryland 21201

Mr. John J. Lancaster
Cooperative Extension Agent
15209 Main Street
P. O. Drawer D
Upper Marlboro, Maryland

Mr. Herbert L. Fishpaw
Plumbers Training Fund
Plumbers Local Union 48
117 W. 24th Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21218

Dr. Max E. Jobe
Executive Director
Suite 304, Jackson Towers
1123 N. Eutaw Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21201

Table of Contents

Foreword iii

Design of Study iv

Evaluation of the State Plan 1

Evaluation of Effectiveness with which People and their Needs are Served 2

Evaluation of Extent to which Council Recommendations have Received Consideration 4

Recommendations 6

Appendix

A. Program Memorandum Office of Education . . . . .

B. Certificate of State Advisory Council . . . . .

C. State Advisory Council Recommendations and State Board Considerations . . . . .

D. Public Attitudes toward Vocational Technical Education in Frederick County . . . . .

E. A Study of Career Guidance in Maryland . . . . .

FOREWORD

This evaluation report comes at the close of an extremely active and productive period for the Maryland State Advisory Council on Vocational Technical Education; a period in which the organization matured into a friendly force and a constructive influence in matters related to the design and development of vocational technical education programs.

The brief statements below give some indication of the dimensions of the Council's interest and involvement in the problems and potentials of vocational technical education in Maryland during fiscal year 1972.

- With the Frederick County Vocational Technical Advisory Council, the State Council sponsored a survey of Public Attitudes Toward Vocational Technical Education in Frederick County conducted by Sidney Hollander Associates, a Baltimore-based consulting firm specializing in opinion research. Designed to demonstrate the feasibility and desirability of graduate follow-up studies, the survey broke new ground in the increasingly important field of accountability and measurement of educational programs. A copy of the summary report is included as Appendix D.

- The Council sponsored and guided a comprehensive study of Career Guidance in Maryland Public Schools, prepared by Dr. Nancy Davis, Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Towson State College. The findings, conclusions and recommendations of the study, first of its kind to be undertaken from without rather than from within the education establishment, have received the endorsements of career guidance specialists of the University of Maryland and the Maryland State Department of Education (SDE). A copy of the summary report is included as Appendix E.

- A position paper on career education, has been prepared by a Council committee, with assistance from the Maryland State Department of Education and the Maryland State Board for Community Colleges. This paper is awaiting review and revision by the Council.

- Apart from regular participation in the affairs of the Council and professional responsibilites ranging from publishing to plumbing, Council members were prominent in a gamut of educational service programs in their respective communities. The list of activities includes membership on county boards of education, boards of trustees of community colleges, local vocational technical education advisory councils, CAMPS committees, community action agencies, career fairs and education committees of local chambers of commerce.

- Council members further expressed their interest in the advancement of vocational technical education in Maryland by attending meetings with the Maryland State Board of Education and the State Board for Community Colleges, and by taking part in the Governor's Conference on Career Education, the State Department Educator's Conference on Career Education, the Washington Conference on Career Education and various conferences and meetings in other states on a variety of subjects related to vocational technical education.

• In addition, members visited vocational technical centers, comprehensive high schools, career development projects, community colleges and technical institutes in Maryland, as well as similar centers in Delaware, South Carolina, North Carolina, Texas and New Jersey. They met also with special vocational education committees and lay groups from Baltimore City and Wicomico, Somerset, Dorchester, Worcester, Harford, Charles, Frederick, Washington, and Baltimore counties, and with groups representing the Chesapeake and Potomac Association of Private Schools, Maryland Vocational Agricultural Teachers Association, Future Farmers of America, University of Maryland, Frostburg State College, Western Maryland College and Bowie State College.

DESIGN OF STUDY

In developing this report, the Evaluation Committee has responded as faithfully as practicable to Office of Education (OE) Program Memorandum AVT (V) 72-44 of May 14, 1972, which suggests goals and proposes a format for 1972 evaluation reports of state advisory councils on vocational education. A copy of the memorandum is included as Appendix A.

Essentially the memorandum instructs State Councils to: (i) examine the goals and priorities of the State Department of Education (SDE) as set forth in the State Plan for the Administration of Vocational Technical Education Programs, (ii) assess the effectiveness with which people and their needs are served, and (iii) determine the extent to which Council recommendations have received due consideration.

Method:

To achieve the goals cited in the memorandum, the following procedural plan was adopted by the Evaluation Committee:

Review of the State Plan for fiscal year 1972.

Review of the available statistical record of fiscal year 1972 as provided by the Division of Vocational Technical Education (DVE).

Interviews with appropriate representatives of DVE with regard to questions contained in the OE program memorandum.

Review of findings and conclusions by full Council membership and refinement of recommendations.

Limitations:

One of the most important measurements of progress against the goals and priorities of the State Plan is the official record of the period for which the Plan was designed. The principal source of that record is the annual report of SDE to the Office of Education.

Unfortunately, this annual report was being prepared by SDE at the time the Committee was conducting the evaluation. Although sections of the document were forwarded for review, the full statement was not available for study within the time frame set for completion of the evaluation.

It should also be noted that a further limitation, related to the matter of timing of reports and plans, affects the efficiency of certain kinds of recommendations, particularly those involving movement of funds.

To meet government funding schedules, SDE must submit its budget and plans to State authorities two years in advance and to appropriate federal agencies one year ahead of need. Given these timetables, there is little likelihood that a recommendation of the Council's evaluation for fiscal year 1972 could be implemented before fiscal year 1974, no matter how beneficial the program or how critical the need or situation it addresses.

I. EVALUATION OF THE STATE PLAN

A. How valid and appropriate were the State's goals and priorities as set forth in the State Plan?

1. Were they valid in terms of students' needs and employment opportunities?

2. Were they sufficiently comprehensive in terms of specific population groups such as disadvantaged, handicapped, returning veterans, adults, post-secondary, et cetera?

3. Were they related appropriately to other manpower development in the State (e.g., private schools, industry, CAMPS, et cetera)?

B. Were procedures set forth in the Plan to accomplish each State goal and/or objective or priority?

By Certificate dated April 28, 1971, and signed by then-Chairman Henry B. Kimmey, the State Advisory Council endorsed with no exceptions the State Plan for fiscal year 1972, agreeing thereby that the goals and priorities were valid and appropriate and that procedures proposed to accomplish them were sufficient.

The Certificate noted that the Plan ". . . reflects the advice and recommendations of the Council . . .", and recommended adoption by the State Board of Education. It stated further that members of the Council were represented on various committees assigned the responsibility for developing and writing the Plan and that a majority of Council members attended and participated in the public hearing on the Plan on April 28, 1971, with a representative of the Council making a major presentation at that hearing. A copy of the Certificate is included as Appendix B.

C. To what extent were the State's goals met during the year under review and to what extent and in what ways does this represent an improvement over last year?

To develop answers representative of the breadth of the inquiry, seven areas of program emphasis were selected for examination: Enrollments, Program Development, Community Involvement, Special Programs, Post-Secondary Programs, Research Activities, In-Service Activities.

Enrollments:

Quantitatively, fiscal 1972 was a year of solid growth and development for vocational technical education in Maryland. Across the State more than 215,000 persons participated in the most comprehensive range of programs ever offered. The record enrollment figures represent an increase of 31% over 1971 totals.

Enrollment increases were common to all categories except apprenticeship programs. Significantly, 38.4% of all secondary school students (grades 10-12) were enrolled in vocational technical programs compared to 35.2% in the previous year. During the same period, the percentage of secondary school enrollees (grades 10-12) classified as "general education students" decreased from 38.4% to 21.6%, indicating substantial progress of SDE's special efforts to reach a larger number of "general" students with vocational technical programs.

Also encouraging are statistics showing that post-secondary enrollment in vocational technical programs rose from 13% (12,758) of total community college enrollments to 33% (19,522).

Smaller increases were recorded among the disadvantaged and handicapped populations. Comparisons of total enrollments in these critical-need areas show: Disadvantaged: 20,982 (1971); 32,863 (1972). Handicapped: 7,658 (1971); 7,908 (1972).

Program Development:

(1) During fiscal 1972, special development emphasis at the secondary school level was accorded occupational home economics, distributive education and health occupations. Measured by enrollment figures only, results were impressive. Enrollees in health occupations and occupational home economics increased by more than 50%, while distributive education enjoyed a more modest 12% advance. SDE representatives expect the growth pattern to continue except for a probable softening in health occupations where the presence of a broad spectrum of health-related courses in the community colleges may affect future enrollment figures.

(2) As another emphasis of the program development effort, SDE planned to conduct a study of the role of student organizations related to various

instructional programs and to develop appropriate guidelines to strengthen the relationships. The status of these activities is not clear at this time. SDE representatives have reported, however, that present faculty pressure to receive compensation for all extra-curricular activities is affecting adversely the general development and vitality of student organizations, particularly in the less affluent school districts.

(3) General development activity benefited from improved systems analysis, data processing procedures, and increased contact in the field and with other agencies which brought further refinement to SDE's continuing program of early identification of emerging trends and new problems and opportunities in vocational technical education. The Maryland research and development program is acknowledged to be one of the most enlightened and effective in the country and has been used as a model by other states.

Community Involvement:

DVE reports that 60% of Maryland's school districts now have local advisory councils, most with viable programs. The extent to which local communities participate in planning and implementing vocational technical education programs remains unclear, however, and the status of a SDE project to ". . . secure and demonstrate ways and means leading to the involvement of the community . . . " is unreported at this time. The plan to prepare an operational handbook to guide agencies in achieving advisory committee goals apparently is delayed also.

Special Programs:

Although there was an increase in general enrollment of disadvantaged persons in vocational technical programs, the presence and performance of the special entry-level skills programs for this problem population, which were among the goals and objectives of the State Plan for fiscal 1972, were difficult to determine. Further, the specific nature and results of the "priority attention" designated in the Plan for the State's seven economically-depressed areas were unclear.

Post-Secondary Programs:

(1) There has been a significant improvement in the quality of cooperation between SDE and the State's community colleges which can be expected to continue as the relationship matures. One enlightened evidence of this increasing maturity is the present planning effort which seeks to avoid duplication of vocational technical services, programs, and equipment at community colleges and secondary schools operating in the same locale, and encourages participation of qualified secondary school students in non-competing vocational technical programs offered by community colleges.

(2) As concerns the question of responsibility for adult and post-secondary vocational technical education programs, no authority has yet announced a policy which clarifies the roles of the community colleges and the secondary schools.

Research Activities:

According to the Division of Vocational Education, progress towards the research goals of the 1972 Plan has been limited by low priorities assigned to vocational education projects by the Division of Research and Evaluation of SDE. One victim of the procedural delay is the follow-up study of high school graduates which, potentially, promises the truest measurement of effectiveness of the vocational technical education program. Another is the development of a guide for use by local school districts in evaluating their programs.

In-Service Activities:

A continuous program to identify and prepare instructors, administrators and supervisors for vocational technical schools is conducted by DVE. Workshops, seminars and conferences are held in all sections of the State. In fiscal 1972, Council members and staff personnel participated in a number of these events by invitation.

II. EVALUATION OF EFFECTIVENESS WITH WHICH PEOPLE AND THEIR NEEDS ARE SERVED

NOTE: To find answers to the several questions asked on this subject by the OE Memorandum, the Evaluation Committee sought in writing and by personal contact opinions of the following organizations and individuals whose professional concerns and responsibilities include this field of

interest: Maryland State Department of Employment and Social Services, Maryland State Department of Economic and Community Development, Maryland State Board for Community Colleges, Maryland Council for Higher Education, Maryland Department of State Planning, Cooperative Area Manpower Planning Services, Chesapeake and Potomac Association of Private Schools, Vocational educators and administrators of local school districts.

A. Are valid data available for planning purposes (i.e., manpower needs, job opportunities and employer needs)?

Among the six resources responding, there was agreement that the need for this kind of data is not being met effectively. Although all used the information that is available, and only one questioned its validity, there were many complaints. Some cited a general lack of data; others questioned the currency and consistency of that which is available. Still another said the absence of adequate state-wide manpower data was among the most significant problems retarding the development of post-secondary career programs.

Conversely the Division of Vocational Education (DVE) indicated that State agencies had expressed satisfaction with existing manpower data and that the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and the National Planning Association had acknowledged Maryland's manpower statistics as ". . . the best in the country".

B. To what extent is there coordination of training opportunities among agencies?

The indication here is that constructive cooperation has been achieved and that significant progress towards effective coordination of programs is being made. Although one resource cited a need for "more coordination", it seems evident that this observation is more in the nature of a call for continued improvement than an indictment of an activity that is obviously developing in a positive and productive way.

C. To what extent is there coordination and articulation among secondary, post-secondary and adult educational agencies?

There is evidence of increasing, resultful cooperation among the agencies concerned. Examples of this desirable coordination and articulation include sharing of facilities and improved access to instruction at all kinds of institutions by all classes of students.

At the local level there is concern that progress has not been as rapid as it should have or could have been, perhaps because of a resistance to cooperation on the part of the principal agencies involved. While this condition probably did exist at the outset, and may still be limiting progress, there is reason to believe that the situation has been acknowledged and is in process of correction. As one resource put it, ". . . the program is maturing".

D. To what extent do educational institutions assure job placement of graduates?

Although the quality of counseling and other assistance may vary widely from location to location, depending on local attitudes and competencies, it is clear that DVE works closely with the Maryland State Department of Employment Security to effect job placement of secondary school graduates. There is considerable room for improvement, however, and progress likely could occur at a faster rate if the program were assigned a higher priority by the educational agencies.

There is legitimate concern, however, at every level except the community college, about the propriety of educational institutions assuming a job-placement responsibility. Obviously this is a matter that must be resolved before real progress can be achieved.

E. To what extent is vocational education involved in the total manpower development programs of the State?

All resources responded positively on this point, indicating a continuous, extensive and productive involvement of vocational education in the State's total manpower development program.

F. To what extent are vocational education opportunities available to all people at the secondary, post-secondary and adult levels?

Vocational technical education is available to more Marylanders today than at any other time in the history of the program. Although many community colleges have yet to shift their emphasis from transfer programs to career development areas, facilities and programs at every level will soon be within convenient reach of the entire population. Despite this generally favorable condition, reactions to the question were mixed, with the indication that this important field of interest requires the close attention and cooperative action of the concerned educational agencies. Of immediate importance, in the judgment of the resources contacted, is an analysis of local programs and their relevance to the critical needs of the community.

G. To what extent is career education provided to all elementary and middle grade students?

In fiscal 1972 career education received the endorsement of the Governor of Maryland and became a major program emphasis of the State Board of Education. Since this was the introductory year, programming was limited to a number of experimental projects in selected school districts. It is likely that career education programs will exist systemwide in fiscal 1973.

With most of the other agencies, the Advisory Council has approved the State's venture into career education. Despite this general endorsement, however, there is concern in many quarters that the new emphasis may divert both interest and funds from existing programs and that this latest formula for upgrading the image of vocational education may in practice prove to be a means of lowering it.

H. What indications are there that students feel that vocational programs adequately meet their needs?

As recorded elsewhere in this report, an SDE sponsored follow-up study of secondary school graduates, designed to measure the effectiveness of vocational technical education programs, apparently was deferred in fiscal 1972.

The only known data available to the Council bearing directly on this question is a study of public attitudes toward vocational education in Frederick County which was jointly sponsored by the State Council and the Frederick County Council (see Appendix D).

This survey found that, overall, four of ten persons interviewed felt they had received as much job preparation in secondary school as they needed and that among those under forty, nearly one-half were satisfied that their education had prepared them adequately for the world of work.

III. EVALUATION OF EXTENT TO WHICH COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS HAVE RECEIVED CONSIDERATION

A. List the Council's previous years' recommendations. What action has resulted from each of these recommendations?

An accounting of the previous recommendations of the Advisory Council and of DVE's considerations thereof appears as Appendix I of the State Plan for fiscal year 1972. A copy is included as Appendix C of this report.

In some instances, the explanation provided in the statement of considerations provides sufficient evidence that action was already proceeding or had been completed at the time the recommendations were received. In others, the action implicit in the consideration has since occurred. In the case of the several studies and publications discussed (notably: Considerations 1, 3, 6, 11), if action has been taken, results have not been reported to the Council.

B. What factors influenced the success or failure of implementation of the recommendations?

As reported above, certain recommendations were in process of implementation at the time they were made, some have received appropriate action during fiscal 1972, and action on others may have occurred, but reports have not been received by the Council.

Accordingly, the measurements of "success" or "failure" would not seem to apply. It can be assumed from the statement of considerations that DVE acknowledged and responded in good faith to the recommendations (although in some instances the response seems more technical than practical), and that action has proceeded at a reasonable rate subject to the usual constraints of time, pressure, available funds and administrative priority.

C. What follow-through is being maintained by the Council (e.g., re-editing, re-submission, new areas for recommendation)?

Some earlier recommendations have been strengthened or modified and resubmitted with this evaluation report. Still others have been expanded and made part of the study of career guidance prepared by a Council committee, (see Appendix E).

In any review of Council recommendations and SDE action thereon, it must be mentioned that the quality and spirit of cooperation between the Council and DVE have not been good and in some cases may have been counter productive.

The Council has taken steps to correct this undesirable situation — notably, seminars with DVE representatives prior to this evaluation to discuss progress against the goals and objectives of the State Plan, a meeting with the State Superintendent of Education to explore ways and means of improving communications, and appointment of DVE personnel to those Council committees conducting studies of various aspects of vocational technical education. DVE also has sought a closer relationship by including Council members on its committees and by encouraging their participation in in-service seminars, workshops and conferences.

Much more needs to be done by both organizations; particularly actions that would achieve: (i) more effective communications between the organizations concerning general and specific reports and materials, and (ii) cooperative working relationships on projects of an experimental, demonstration, or study nature.

RECOMMENDATIONS

THE ADVISORY COUNCIL RECOMMENDS. . .

. . .That a joint committee of the Department of Education and the Council undertake to bring together representatives of concerned agencies for the purpose of designing a statewide manpower data collection and interpretation system worthy of support by all interested parties.

. . .That community involvement in planning and administering local programs should continue to be stressed, with special emphasis placed on the utilization of local advisory councils. The Advisory Council recommends that the Council and the Division of Vocational Education form a joint committee to seek ways and means of implementing this recommendation.

. . .That the State Board of Education and its staff further increase their efforts in the development of a program to help build a favorable image toward vocational technical education.

Such a program should include a series of workshops for school administrators, counselors, and teachers. Emphasis should be placed upon information about employment opportunities, educational requirements, economic and other benefits of the various vocations, with the primary attention devoted to those jobs requiring less than a baccalaureate degree. The workshops should involve extensive dialogue between educators and representatives of business, industry, labor, government, and other local groups.

. . .That local systems be notified by the State Department of Education of the amount and timing of Federal vocational education appropriations not later than thirty days after SDE has received similiar notification from the Office of Education.

. . .That the State Department of Education makes an annual report to the public within 120 days after the close of the fiscal year. This report should provide evidence of progress toward goals for vocational technical education as contained in the State Plan. The report also should contain a financial statement which explains to whom money was distributed and how it was used. Distribution of this report should be made to elected officials, school board members, local advisory councils, P.T.A.'s, and other concerned individuals and organizations.

. . .That the State Department of Education give proper emphasis to vocational education research projects, particularly those concerned with student follow-up and program evaluation, to assure a planned future development of vocational education programs in Maryland.

. . .That the State Department of Education work with local systems in developing procedures for implementing the State policy on student placement. The State should hold the local systems responsible for maintaining an effective student placement program or else arrange with other agencies to provide placement services.

. . .That the State Department of Education set forth in the State Plan for Vocational Education more definite goals for serving the handicapped and disadvantaged, and that particular attention be given to political sub-divisions designated as depressed or redevelopment areas.

. . .That the State Board of Education and the State Board for Community Colleges increase their efforts to assure that vocational technical programs reflect not only local, but regional, state and national manpower needs. Further steps should be taken to improve articulation between secondary and post-secondary programs and to prevent costly and unnecessary duplication of programs. The two State agencies should be increasingly sensitive to the need for vocational programs to meet new and emerging occupational trends in Maryland and to provide trained personnel for those occupations presently experiencing manpower shortages.

. . .That the State Board of Education review the recommendations made in the Council-sponsored study Career Guidance in Maryland (Appendix E) and prepare a response to each recommendation.

APPENDIX A

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
BUREAU OF ADULT, VOCATIONAL, AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION

PROGRAM MEMORANDUM -- AVT (V) 72-44 May 15, 1972

SENT BY: Michael Russo, Acting Director
Division of Vocational and Technical Education

SENT TO: State Directors of Vocational Education
Executive Officers, State Boards for Vocational Education
Executive Directors and Chairmen of State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education.
Regional Directors, AVTE
Program Officers, VTE
Headquarters Staff

SUBJECT: Goals and Recommendations for State Advisory Council Evaluation Reports

This outline sets forth the suggested goals and format for the 1972 Evaluation Reports of the State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education. An Ad Hoc Committee with representation from the National Advisory Council, State Advisory Councils, and the USOE developed these suggested goals which reflect the previous year's experience. Additionally, there are included some recommendations by the Ad Hoc Committee of State Advisory Councils on the preparation of the annual evaluation reports.

All the statements of suggested goals and recommended activities are strictly recommendations. <u>However, it is urged that each Council follow this format to every extent possible</u>.

A. <u>The Suggested Goals for State Council Evaluations</u>

Goal I: <u>Evaluation should focus on the State's goals and as set forth in the State plan</u>.

1. How valid and appropriate were the State's goals and priorities?

   a. Were they valid in terms of student needs and employment opportunities?

   b. Were they sufficiently comprehensive in terms of specific population groups such as disadvantaged, handicapped, returning veterans, adults, post-secondary, etc.?

   c. Were they related appropriately to other manpower development in the State (e.g., private schools, industry, CAMPS, etc.)?

2. Were procedures set forth in the State plan to accomplish each stated goal and/or objective or priority?

3. To what extent were the State's goals met during the year under review and to what extent and in what ways does this represent an improvement over last year?

Goal II: Evaluation should focus upon the effectiveness with which people and their needs are served.

1. Are valid data available for planning purposes (i.e., manpower needs, job opportunities, and employer needs)?

2. To what extent is there coordination of training opportunities among agencies?

3. To what extent is there coordination and articulation among secondary, post-secondary, and adult education agencies?

4. To what extent do educational institutions assure job placement of graduates?

5. To what extent is vocational education involved in total manpower development programs of the State?

6. To what extent are vocational education opportunities available to all people at the secondary, post-secondary, and adult levels?

7. To what extent is career education provided to all elementary and middle grade pupils?

8. What indications are there that students feel that vocational programs adequately meet their needs?

Goal III: Evaluation should focus on the extent to which Council recommendations have received due consideration.

1. List the Council's previous year's recommendations. What action has resulted from each of these recommendations?

2. What factors influenced the success or failure of implementation of the recommendations?

3. What follow-through is being maintained by the Council (e.g., re-editing, resubmission, new areas for recommendations)?

B. Recommendations Based on Last Year's Reports

The following is reiterated again for the 1972 Evaluation Reports at the request of the "Ad Hoc Committee":

1. The annual evaluation report of the State Advisory Council should be developed by the Council and its staff and should represent the thinking of the Council. Studies contracted by the Council, information supplied by the State agencies, and inputs from other sources should be used only as backup data for the Council report and should not substitute for the evaluation report to be developed by the Council.

2. A variety of techniques and materials or sources of materials should be used in the development of the annual evaluation report. Techniques employed by Councils in previous reports which appear appropriate for Council use include (It is suggested that several of these be used, rather than base the report on a single technique or source of data.):

   a. Evaluation activities carried out or directed by individual members or committees of the Council.

   b. Evaluation activities carried out by the Council and its professional staff.

   c. Evaluation activities designed to elicit lay citizen viewpoints concerning vocational education, e.g., meetings at which the public is given opportunities to express views on vocational education, studies specifically designed to determine citizen views.

   d. Evaluation activities designed to elicit viewpoints of former vocational education students concerning vocational education.

   e. Evaluation activities based upon analyses of data secured from State employment agencies, State educational agencies, etc.

   f. Examination and synthesis of evaluation studies conducted by the State educational agency.

   g. Contracted studies of specified elements to be used for particular segments of the total evaluation activity.

FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION CONTACT: Harold F. Duis
Program Specialist
Reports and Data (State Plans)
Program Support Branch

Phone: (202) 963-3291

APPENDIX B

Certificate of State Advisory Council

State of Maryland

I hereby certify that the attached State plan for fiscal year 1972 was prepared in consultation with the State Advisory Council. It reflects the advice and recommendations of the Council as indicated by the following statements:

1. Members of the Advisory Council were represented on the various committees assigned the responsibility for developing and writing the plan.

2. Representatives of the Council attended the public hearing on April 28, 1971 and the Vice Chairman of the Council made a major presentation at this hearing.

3. A majority of the Council members attended and participated in the public hearing held on April 28, 1971.

4. I would recommend the adoption of this plan by the State Board of Education.

State Advisory Council

4/28/71
(Date)

BY: s/Henry B. Kimmey
Chairman of State Advisory Council
on Vocational Technical Education

APPENDIX C

State Advisory Council Recommendations and State Board Considerations

Advisory Council Recommendations	State Board Considerations of Recommendations
1. The State Board of Education join efforts with the Departments of Employment and Social Services and Economic and Community Development in developing a Statewide system of collecting and distributing data on current and projected manpower needs.	1. Currently, the Division of Vocational Technical Education is engaged in co-operative efforts with the State Department of Planning and Department of Employment Security for determining current and projected manpower needs. A comprehensive study of need has been initiated and provided information which has been distributed to all local agencies for use in planing occupational education. This format of their study is currently being applied to 1970 Census information to update current and future needs. Information from the study will be available during Fiscal 1973.
2. The State Board of Education and the Maryland State Board for Community Colleges establish a policy for implementation of functional responsibilities for the State Board for Community Colleges in vocational-technical education.	2. The present State Plan Part I designates the Maryland State Board of Education as the sole agent for administration and supervision of vocational-technical programs (See Appendix A) The Division of Vocational-Technical Education cooperates with the State Board for Community Colleges in approval and operation of vocational-technical programs at the post-secondary level.
3. The need for community involvement in planning and administering local programs continues to be stressed with special emphasis placed on the utlization of local advisory councils.	3. The State recognizes the need of local involvement of advisory groups and has directed the Division of Vocational-Technical Education to publish guidelines for utilization of local advisory groups. In addition, each local plan consists of a section that reflects advisory group memberships and activities.

(Continued . . .)

Advisory Council Recommendations	State Board Considerations of Recommendations
4. The State Board of Education and its staff make a careful study of career education and establish its goals and priorities in relation to its responsibilities in providing this part of every student's education, and how it can best carry out this responsibility.	4. The State Board has by resolution established career education as one of the priorities for the Department of Education. Budget requests for State funding have been initiated.
5. The State Board of Education develop a policy toward job placement of students as a part of its educational responsibility.	5. The State Board of Education in accepting the responsibilities of Vocational-Technical Education and the Act of 1968 has an established policy regarding placement of students as part of its educational responsibility (Federal Register Volume 35 Section 102.8 and Appendix B of this Plan).
6. The State Board of Education and its staff arrange for the development of a program to help build a favorable image toward the world of work and vocational-technical education. Such a program should include a series of workshops for school administrators, counselors, and teachers. Emphasis should be placed upon information about employment opportunities, educational requirements, economic, and other benefits of the various vocations with primary attention devoted to those jobs requiring less than a baccalaureate degree. The workshops should involve extensive dialogue between educators and representatives of business, industry, labor government, and other lay groups.	6. The State has taken steps to assure a favorable image toward the world of work and vocational-technical education. Currently, a conference is scheduled for June 27-28 for local administrators, counselors, and teachers to introduce the aspects of career education. An apprenticeship handbook is being prepared for distribution to schools for use of students, teachers, and administrators. The State and the Governor annually proclaim Vocational Education Week and various activities are conducted in vocational facilities State-wide to improve the public image of vocational education and the world of work. Vocational youth groups and activities (FFA, FHA, FBLA, and DECA) are encouraged and supported by the State to enhance the image of work and vocational education.

(Continued . . .)

Advisory Council Recommendations	State Board Considerations of Recommendations
7. The State Plan contain more realistic goals accompanied with a description of the steps and a time-table associated with reaching each respective goal.	7. The new State Plan format reflects the recommendations of the Advisory Council (See Table III Pages II-41 - II-7
8. A mid-year and year-end status report be prepared and distributed on those goals included in the Plan.	8. A yearly descriptive and statistical report is prepared and submitted to the Federal Government. This report has been provided for the Advisory Council Review.
9. The goals of the State Plan be integrated with and become a part of the overall goals for education in the State.	9. Bylaw 342:1 is enacted annually as goal objectives and activities of the Division of Vocational-Technical Education. In addition, the current Department of Education planning system is designed to incorporate all goals of education in the State.
10. The State Board of Education make a greater committment to Vocational-Technical Education by clearly establishing its priorities in that area and by allocating an increased percentage of its budget to that end.	10. The State Board has made a commitment to Vocational-Technical Education through emphasis of Career Education which is reflected in Consideration No. four (4).
11. The State Department of Education develop a procedure which will permit notification to local systems of expected vocational allotments within a minimun period of time after Federal allocations are made to the State.	11. The Division of Vocational-Technical Education is presently initiating and considering procedures which will expedite notification of vocational allocations to local systems.

APPENDIX D

PUBLIC ATTITUDES TOWARD
VOCATIONAL TECHNICAL EDUCATION
IN FREDERICK COUNTY

Prepared for
Frederick County Vocational Technical Advisory Council
and
Maryland Advisory Council on Vocational Technical Education

June, 1972

SIDNEY HOLLANDER ASSOCIATES • MARKETING AND OPINION RESEARCH

SUMMARY

Frederick County residents show general support of their public education system and, within the system, give high priority to vocational technical training. They believe overwhelmingly that public education should provide "special vocational training.... for those who want it" and are generally favorable to special vo-tech centers.

A large majority believe that the school should "take an active part in planning each child's education toward a job," that such planning should begin no later than the tenth grade, and that it should include consideration of the entire job market even if this leads to employment outside the County. A bare majority believe that the schools should "attempt to place its graduates in jobs" and should initiate vocational programs to attract industry, but residents overwhelmingly endorse evening vocational courses for adults. Those residents who went beyond high school are more favorable to vo-tech generally than are those with least formal education.

Seven out of ten of those interviewed know someone who has attended Frederick Community College, one in four knows someone who has received agriculture or business training in a Frederick County high school, and one in eight knows someone who has received other vocational training in a Frederick County high school. Favorable impressions were received from an overwhelming majority of all three types.

About half of those interviewed were satisfied with the information they received while in school "to help you choose a vocation"; but a clear majority, largely those who did not complete high school, felt that their own job preparation in school was inadequate.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

page

PURPOSE AND METHOD. 1

FINDINGS

I. Perspective on the County. 5

II. Attitudes toward Career Education. 7

III. Familiarity with County Education. 9

IV. Interviewee Characteristics. 10

TABLES

QUESTIONNAIRE

PURPOSE AND METHOD

The purpose of this study is to ascertain awareness and attitudes of Frederick County residents toward vocational-technical education programs and facilities within the County. In planning the study, the sponsoring committees felt that it would be useful for decision makers to know how County residents felt about these subjects.

Discussion with staff members of the sponsoring organizations, and with the Frederick County Advisory Council itself, yielded a number of topics for investigation which were reduced to manageable proportions and drafted into questionnaire form. This draft questionnaire was tested and test results reviewed with the staff executives; the questionnaire was then revised and put into final form for telephone administration. A copy of the questionnaire is appended.

The major sample of the study consists of 500 interviews obtained in November 1971 by interviewers recruited and trained by Sidney Hollander Associates. The sample was systematically selected from the County telephone directory. Telephone numbers for residents of adjacent counties were omitted. In order to avoid bias introduced by interviewing only those who are most readily reached at home, interviewers were instructed to work from a "bank" system of pre-listed numbers, making up to four calls at different times of day and days of the week until an interview was obtained. Only in the case of a disconnected number, a refusal, or four unsuccessful attempts to obtain an interview was another number added to the "bank." Interviewers were instructed to speak with "either the man of the house or the lady of the house"; this procedure yielded 63 percent of the interviews with women, 37 percent with men. Other household members, such as adult children living with parents, or parents of

either household head, were not eligible for interview. Thus, the opinions reported in the findings which follow are those of a reasonably representative sample of household heads in telephone homes.

In addition to the main body of the telephone sample, the same questionnaire was used in interviews with men or women household heads in non-telephone homes, in order to obtain an indication of opinions held by this population component. These households were selected from records in 25 elementary schools which indicated presence or absence of a telephone in the home. From this pool of non-telephone households 59 interviews were obtained by student volunteers from the sociology classes at Hood College and Frederick Community College in February and March 1972, after briefing by a representative of the research firm.

Because it was not feasible to select the sample or conduct the interviews in as rigorous a manner as for telephone homes, results of the 59 interviews in non-telephone homes cannot be considered representative of this segment of the population. For this reason they have not been combined with those from the telephone sample but are shown in the tabular findings in parallel columns, providing an indication of the ways in which opinions might differ between the two components. Like the main sample, these results are shown as percentages, but in parentheses to indicate that the sample size is smaller than is customary when percentages are used.

This report is in two parts. The first is a narrative summary of findings presented in groupings of subject matter, according to topical interest; it will be noted that this does not necessarily coincide with the logical sequence in which questions were asked. The second part of the report (on yellow paper) consists of a tabular presentation of findings. In addition to separate totals for the telephone and non-telephone components, results are shown according to four characteristics of the telephone

sample: sex, age, and education of the interviewee; and presence of school children in the household. For convenient reference, tables are presented in sequence, corresponding to the order in which questions were asked in the interview. Parenthetical reference is made from the text by question number.

The firm of Sidney Hollander Associates is pleased to have had the opportunity to develop and conduct this study, which in some ways is a pioneer effort in the field of vocational-technical education. We wish to acknowledge the efforts of the County and State Councils on Vocational Technical Education, who participated in the development of the study and with whom results have been reviewed. Development and execution of the study were conducted in consultation with Max E. Jobe, Executive Director of the Maryland Advisory Council on Vocational Technical Education and Michael R. Morton, Supervisor of Vocational-Industrial Arts for the Frederick County Board of Education. Both of these men gave continuous advice in arranging for details and in interpretation of technical matters. Dr. R. F. Gould, Professor of Sociology at Hood College, and Richard Flaherty, of the Frederick County Board of Education, were instrumental in arranging for work done by student volunteers and in supervising them. Special thanks go to James W. Freeman, President of the Frederick Gas Company and Chairman of the Frederick County Advisory Council, who helped to formulate and guide the project and was generous with facilities and ideas for its execution.

Acknowledgement is due, too, to the professional interviewers, all residents of the County, who conducted the telephone interviews: the Mrs. Iva Coblentz, Beverly Grigsby, Loretta Kimmel, Amy D. McHenry, Judith Waldeck Morton, Lynn D. Reece, Priscilla Wirts; Miss Lana L. Holcomb; Mr. Charles Blackman; and to the student volunteers who conducted in-home interviews in non-telephone homes: the Misses Karen Beachley, Gail Eyler, Janet Heck, Linda Kolb, Alice Podolak, Sandy Warehime, Martha White; Mrs. Linda B. Gregory; the Messrs. Lyman Myers, Eugene Wallace, John C. Wright, Jr.

Finally, our thanks are extended to the 559 men and women who gave their opinions. We hope that their willingness to respond will help all residents of the County to obtain the kind of educational system they want, as indicated in the following survey findings.

FINDINGS

I. Perspective on the County

To put the subject of County education in perspective, the interview opened with two questions about the outlook for growth. These show that most residents think the present rate of growth is preferred to either a faster or a slower pace (Question 1a)* but that the County should try to get more industry (Question 1b) and should encourage new residential development for Washington area commuters (Question 1c). Only about one-fourth feel that Frederick County is growing too fast, one-tenth that it is too industrial; almost two-fifths would not encourage new developments for Washington commuters.

Men tend to give more expansionist replies than women do on all three counts. Interviewees with highest educational attainments are more strongly opposed to both a faster rate of industrial development and the encouragement of Washington bedroom communities than are those with high school education or less.

Two-fifths think the County does not spend "enough" on public education, rather than "too much" or "about the right amount" (Question 2). In this respect education is given median rating among five public services.

	Not Enough	*Too Much*
County roads	51%	5%
Public library	41%	4%
Public education	39%	15%
Public health	35%	3%
Public welfare	10%	57%

*Tabular results for each question are shown on the yellow pages that follow this text summary.

On the other hand, it should be noted that 15 percent feel that "too much" is being spent for education, compared with negligible proportions who feel expenditures are too high for roads, health and libraries. The negative 15 percent comes largely from men, from those 50 and older, and from those with least education.

Of eight specific types of expenditure within the County school system, two concerned with vocational-technical education rank second and fourth in the proportion of citizens who think expenditure should be increased (Question 4):

85% *Special education for the handicapped*
75% *More types of vocational and technical education*
72% *Providing more teachers so as to have smaller classes*
62% *Job counseling*
60% *Expanding the Community College*
44% *School buildings and classroom equipment*
43% *Offering a wider variety of courses*
29% *Athletic teams and facilities*

All eight of these types of educational expenditure tend to be favored more by those under 50 years of age than by those older, but (except for buildings and equipment) about equally by those with and without children in school. Most expenditures, too, are favored about equally by those with more and less educational attainment, but "more types of vocational and technical education" is decidedly more favored by those who themselves have had more education.

II. Attitudes toward Career Education

Seven out of eight of all replying to the questionnaire, and an even larger proportion of those under 40, believe that "public schools should offer special vocational training in agriculture, business or technical skills for those who want it, in addition to basic education for everyone" (Question 9a). A large majority of these also favor the idea of a "vocational-technical center with specialized classes and facilities that would draw eleventh and twelfth grade students from anywhere in the County for one or two days a week" (Question 9b).

While an overwhelming majority thus believe in the availability of such training "for those who want it," there is less certainty on the extent of school responsibility in planning the child's career. Nearly three-fourths of the main sample (but a higher proportion of those in non-telephone homes) believe that "schools should also take an active part in planning each child's education toward a job" (Question 10a). Younger adults and those with most education are most likely to support the school's role in career planning. Half of those who believe in the school's active participation feel that career planning should begin by the eighth or ninth grade; only one in six would put it off as far as the eleventh grade (Question 10b).

The 72 percent who want the schools to be active in career guidance also believe by a two-to-one majority that job availability should be taken into account as well as the child's interest and ability (Question 10c); and nearly all of these agree that jobs everywhere be taken into consideration, not just those within the County (Question 10d). Most of the 72 percent feel that the school system should also try to place graduates in jobs (Question 10e). Nearly all those interviewed (95 percent of the entire sample) approve of "evening programs for adults to improve job skills or learn new skills" (Question 11).

The suggestion that Frederick County should emulate those places where "the schools initiate special vocational programs in order to attract industry" (Question 12) is favored three-to-two (and by an even larger plurality of the non-telephone sample). Vocational emphasis is seen, too, in the large majority who regard Frederick Community College as "primarily a means of training for a career" (Question 5), rather than "primarily a way for students to enter a four-year college."

III. Familiarity with County Education

Half of those interviewed were willing to give an estimate of the amount they "think it costs the school system to educate a high school student in Frederick County" per year (Question 3). The median estimate was $838, with about one-fifth of the estimates under $500 and another fifth $2,000 or over.

One-fourth "personally know anyone who received vocational training in agriculture or business in a Frederick County high school" (Question 7a), about equally divided between agriculture and business (Question 7c). Only half as many are acquainted with "anyone who received any other kind of vocational training" in a local high school (Question 8a) and these were trained in construction, mechanics, and a wide variety of other skills from music to "social work" (Question 8c). Those who received such vocational training are almost unanimously believed to have had a favorable opinion of it (Questions 7b and 8b).

Seventy percent of the main sample (but only 29 percent of the non-telephone) "personally know anyone who has attended the Frederick Community College" (Question 6a), about equally divided between vo-tech and college prep courses (Question 6b). Interviewees with less than 12th grade education know twice as many vo-tech students as college-prep at Frederick Community College, while the preponderance is in the other direction among those who had gone beyond high school. Again, opinions of these students are thought to have been overwhelmingly favorable (Question 6c).

IV. Interviewee Characteristics

As mentioned in the section on Method, about five-eighths of those interviewed are women, three-eighths men. Nearly one-fifth are in their twenties, about one-fourth in their thirties, one-fourth in their forties (Question 17d). Two-thirds live in families of two, three or four persons; only one in ten lives alone (Question 17c).

About one-third did not complete high school, compared with one-sixth who are college graduates (Question 16). There is a pronounced relationship between age and education; for example, one-fourth of those 50 and older had only a grade school education compared with only one percent of those under 40.

About half (but nearly three-fourths of those in their forties) have children "in any school, kindergarten through high school" (Question 17a). (Nearly all of the non-telephone households have a child in school, reflecting the way the sample was selected.) Four percent have a household member currently enrolled in Frederick Community College (Question 17b).

Looking back on their own education, the sample is equally divided between those who feel they did, and did not, get "as much information as you needed at that time to help you choose a vocation" (Question 13). But only four in ten feel they got as much job preparation as they wanted in school (Question 14). Dissatisfaction with preparation is above average among those fifty and older and among those with least education.

Detailed analysis (not shown in the tables) indicates that those educated in Frederick County public schools (Question 15) are on the whole less satisfied with the job preparation they got in school than are those who went to other schools, but this is explained statistically by the great preponderance of local public education among

those with less than high school completion who are older, on the average; that is, it is this group which shows greatest dissatisfaction with their job preparation, and it is also the group which predominantly received its job preparation in local public schools. Indeed, when this is analyzed separately for those under 40, nearly half say they got "as much job preparation" as they wanted, and the figure is identical (46 percent) for both those who received this preparation in Frederick County public schools and those who got it elsewhere.

TABLES

In the following tables, findings of the 59 interviews in non-telephone homes are shown in parentheses to indicate that the sample size is smaller than is customary when percentages are used.

Question 1a: *Do you think the County is growing too fast, not fast enough, or do you like the way it's growing as it is?*

Total			Sex		Age			Children in School		Education		
Phone	Personal		Men	Women	Under 40	40's	50 & Over	Yes	No	Less than 12 years	12 years	More than 12 years
24%	(17%)	Too fast	20%	27%	21%	29%	25%	25%	23%	21%	25%	25%
10	(13)	Not fast enough	11	9	10	11	8	9	11	11	9	9
61	(58)	Way it is	65	58	65	51	62	61	60	60	62	61
5	(12)	Don't know/Not sure	4	6	4	9	5	5	6	8	4	5
100%	(100%)	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Question 1b: *Well, about industry in Frederick County. Do you think Frederick County is becoming too industrial, or do you think we should try to get more industry?*

9%	(19%)	Too industrial	9%	9%	13%	4%	6%	10%	7%	2%	11%	12%
66	(52)	Try to get more	73	61	64	69	66	65	67	75	64	58
20	(22)	All right as is	15	23	19	23	20	20	20	17	20	24
5	(7)	Don't know/Not sure	3	7	4	4	8	5	6	6	5	6
100%	(100%)	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Question 1c: *And what about new housing for people who work around Washington? Do you think the County should encourage that kind of residential development, or not?*

50%	(53%)	Should encourage	55%	48%	48%	48%	54%	50%	51%	52%	50%	50%
37	(37)	Should not	35	38	42	43	28	39	35	29	38	44
13	(10)	Don't know/Not sure	10	14	10	9	18	11	14	19	12	6
100%	(100%)	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
(500)	(59)	Base: Number of Interviews	(185)	(315)	(209)	(116)	(175)	(241)	(259)	(159)	(204)	(137)

Question 2a-e: *Now I'm going to mention some types of County expenditures and I'd like to know whether you feel Frederick County spends too much, not enough, or about the right amount on each of them. The first is.....*

Total			Sex		Age			Children in School		Education		
Phone	Personal		Men	Women	Under 40	40's	50 & Over	Yes	No	Less than 12 years	12 years	More than 12 years
		Public health										
3%	(8%)	Too much	5%	2%	2%	6%	3%	3%	4%	5%	3%	1%
35	(39)	Not enough	38	33	35	33	37	33	37	33	34	39
34	(39)	Right amount	36	32	36	35	29	39	28	36	35	29
28	(14)	Don't know	21	33	27	26	31	25	31	26	28	31
100%	(100%)	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
		Public library										
4%	(2%)	Too much	8%	2%	3%	6%	3%	3%	5%	6%	2%	4%
41	(14)	Not enough	43	40	43	40	39	45	38	24	40	61
33	(52)	Right amount	36	32	37	32	31	33	33	40	35	24
22	(32)	Don't know	13	26	17	22	27	19	24	30	23	11
100%	(100%)	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
		Welfare										
57%	(39%)	Too much	60%	56%	59%	53%	58%	58%	56%	62%	60%	48%
10	(22)	Not enough	10	10	11	9	10	10	11	13	6	14
14	(17)	Right amount	16	13	13	16	14	14	14	13	12	18
19	(22)	Don't know	14	21	17	22	18	18	19	12	22	20
100%	(100%)	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
(500)	(59)	Base: Number of Interviews	(185)	(315)	(209)	(116)	(175)	(241)	(259)	(159)	(204)	(137)

[CONTINUED]

Question 2a-e: *(Continued)*

Total			Sex		Age			Children in School		Education		
Phone	Personal		Men	Women	Under 40	40's	50 & Over	Yes	No	Less than 12 years	12 years	More than 12 years
		County roads										
5%	(14%)	Too much	4%	6%	4%	6%	6%	3%	7%	8%	4%	4%
51	(54)	Not enough	50	52	54	53	46	55	48	56	54	41
36	(20)	Right amount	42	33	38	34	35	37	35	30	35	45
8	(12)	Don't know	4	9	4	7	13	5	10	6	7	10
100%	(100%)	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
		Public education										
15%	(10%)	Too much	19%	13%	12%	14%	21%	12%	18%	20%	13%	14%
39	(41)	Not enough	34	43	50	39	27	45	34	36	40	41
36	(32)	Right amount	43	31	32	35	40	35	36	31	39	36
10	(17)	Don't know	4	13	6	12	12	8	12	13	8	9
100%	(100%)	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Question 3: *About how much per year do you think it costs the school system to educate a high school student in Frederick County, on the average--just a rough estimate?*

9%	(9%)	Under $500	11%	8%	11%	9%	7%	11%	8%	6%	9%	13%
11	(10)	$500 to $799	14	10	12	15	9	11	11	11	13	10
13	(-)	$800 to $999	15	12	16	15	7	18	8	10	11	20
2	(3)	$1000 to $1500	5	-	2	1	2	1	3	1	1	4
2	(3)	$1500 to $1999	4	1	3	1	3	2	3	2	3	2
9	(10)	$2000 or over	12	6	12	8	5	10	7	5	10	10
54	(65)	Don't know	39	63	44	51	67	47	60	65	53	41
100%	(100%)	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
$838	($725)	Median Amount	$874	$814	$864	$806	$816	$846	$822	$806	$822	$870
(500)	(59)	Base: Number of Interviews	(185)	(315)	(209)	(116)	(175)	(241)	(259)	(159)	(204)	(137)

Question 4: *Here are some of the things the County School system spends money for. Please tell me whether you feel the County should spend more on any of these things. The first one is....* (In the following table the items are listed in order of percentage of "Yes" answers.)

Total			Sex		Age			Children in School		Education		
Phone	Personal		Men	Women	Under 40	40's	50 & Over	Yes	No	Less than 12 years	12 years	More than 12 years
		Special education for the handicapped										
85%	(93%)	Yes	84%	85%	91%	83%	80%	86%	84%	88%	87%	80%
8	(2)	No	8	8	4	11	10	8	8	4	7	13
7	(5)	Don't know	8	7	5	6	10	6	8	8	6	7
100%	(100%)	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
		More types of vocational and technical education										
75%	(84%)	Yes	78%	72%	79%	80%	66%	77%	71%	63%	78%	81%
15	(8)	No	16	15	13	16	17	16	15	20	13	13
10	(8)	Don't know	6	13	8	4	17	7	14	17	9	6
100%	(100%)	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
		Providing more teachers so as to have smaller classes										
72%	(85%)	Yes	68%	76%	83%	69%	63%	74%	71%	69%	76%	73%
22	(15)	No	25	19	16	23	27	23	20	23	19	23
6	(-)	Don't know	7	5	1	8	10	3	9	8	5	4
100%	(100%)	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
(500)	(59)	Base: Number of Interviews	(185)	(315)	(209)	(116)	(175)	(241)	(259)	(159)	(204)	(137)

[CONTINUED]

Question 4: *(Continued)*

Total			Sex		Age			Children in School		Education		
Phone	Personal		Men	Women	Under 40	40's	50 & Over	Yes	No	Less than 12 years	12 years	More than 12 years
		Job counseling										
62%	(80%)	Yes	58%	63%	67%	58%	57%	62%	61%	65%	59%	61%
23	(12)	No	30	19	21	33	19	25	21	21	25	24
15	(8)	Don't know	12	18	12	9	24	13	18	14	16	15
100%	(100%)	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
		Expanding the Community College										
60%	(56%)	Yes	61%	58%	62%	64%	54%	60%	59%	54%	62%	61%
24	(17)	No	27	23	26	23	23	25	24	19	26	28
16	(27)	Don't know	12	19	12	13	23	15	17	27	12	11
100%	(100%)	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
		School buildings and classroom equipment										
44%	(54%)	Yes	42%	46%	56%	43%	32%	50%	38%	45%	47%	41%
43	(31)	No	48	40	36	45	50	40	46	43	41	46
13	(15)	Don't know	10	14	8	12	18	10	16	12	12	13
100%	(100%)	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
		Offering a wider variety of courses										
43%	(68%)	Yes	45%	43%	48%	42%	38%	42%	44%	43%	44%	43%
42	(24)	No	45	40	42	49	37	49	36	36	44	45
15	(8)	Don't know	10	17	10	9	25	9	20	21	12	12
100%	(100%)	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
		Athletic teams and facilities										
29%	(25%)	Yes	32%	27%	32%	33%	21%	31%	26%	27%	33%	24%
62	(58)	No	64	60	61	65	62	62	62	58	58	72
9	(17)	Don't know	4	13	7	2	17	7	12	15	9	4
100%	(100%)	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
		Base: Number of										
(500)	(59)	Interviews	(185)	(315)	(209)	(116)	(175)	(241)	(259)	(159)	(204)	(137)

Question 5: *Do you think the Frederick Community College should be primarily a way for students to enter a four-year college, or primarily a means of training for a career?*

Total			Sex		Age			Children in School		Education		
Phone	Personal		Men	Women	Under 40	40's	50 & Over	Yes	No	Less than 12 years	12 years	More than 12 years
21%	(8%)	Primarily for college	19%	21%	21%	24%	16%	22%	19%	16%	22%	23%
47	(34)	Primarily for career	48	47	48	45	47	46	48	54	47	39
20	(46)	Both	24	18	23	23	16	25	16	11	19	33
12	(12)	Don't know/Not sure	9	14	8	8	21	7	17	19	12	5
100%	(100%)	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Question 6a: *Do you personally know anyone who has attended the Frederick Community College?*

70%	(29%)	Yes	66%	73%	73%	76%	63%	73%	68%	56%	75%	80%
30	(71)	No	34	27	27	24	37	27	32	44	25	20
100%	(100%)	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Question 6b: *Did they go to the Community College to get into a four-year college, or to take a vocational, technical or occupational program?* (Asked of those who knew someone who had attended the Community College.)

23%	(4%)	Enter college	21%	25%	25%	29%	17%	26%	21%	13%	25%	33%
27	(17)	Vo-Tech	24	29	30	24	26	28	26	27	31	22
20	(8)	Both/Don't know	21	19	18	23	20	19	21	16	19	25
70%	(29%)	Total	66%	73%	73%	76%	63%	73%	68%	56%	75%	80%

Question 6c: *What did they think of it?* (Asked of those who knew someone who had attended the Community College.)

52%	(17%)	Favorable opinion	51%	52%	51%	54%	51%	52%	51%	40%	57%	58%
5	(2)	Unfavorable opinion	4	5	6	5	3	6	4	3	4	8
13	(10)	No opinion/ Don't know	11	16	16	17	9	15	13	13	14	14
70%	(29%)	Total	66%	73%	73%	76%	63%	73%	68%	56%	75%	80%
(500)	(59)	Base: Number of Interviews	(185)	(315)	(209)	(116)	(175)	(241)	(259)	(159)	(204)	(137)

Question 8a: *Do you personally know anyone who received any <u>other</u> kind of vocational training in a Frederick County high school?*

Total			Sex		Age			Children in School		Education		
Phone	Personal		Men	Women	Under 40	40's	50 & Over	Yes	No	Less than 12 years	12 years	More than 12 years
13%	(17%)	Yes	18%	10%	14%	18%	8%	14%	11%	9%	15%	14%
87	(83)	No	82	90	86	82	92	86	89	91	85	86
100%	(100%)	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Question 8b: *What did they think of it?* (Asked of those who knew someone who had received such training.)

10%	(12%)	Favorable opinion	14%	7%	11%	14%	5%	11%	8%	6%	12%	9%
1	(5)	Unfavorable opinion	-	1	1	2	*	1	*	-	1	1
2	(-)	No opinion/Don't know	4	2	2	2	3	2	3	3	2	4
13%	(17%)	Total	18%	10%	14%	18%	8%	14%	11%	9%	15%	14%

Question 8c: *What kind of job did they prepare for?* (Asked of those who knew someone who had received such training.)

5%	(2%)	Construction**	10%	3%	7%	7%	2%	8%	3%	3%	6%	7%
3	(10)	Mechanics***	3	2	4	2	1	3	2	1	5	1
4	(3)	All other****	3	4	1	7	4	2	4	3	3	5
1	(2)	Don't know	2	1	2	2	1	1	2	2	1	1
13%	(17%)	Total	18%	10%	14%	18%	8%	14%	11%	9%	15%	14%
		Base: Number of										
(500)	(59)	Interviews	(185)	(315)	(209)	(116)	(175)	(241)	(259)	(159)	(204)	(137)

*Less than 0.5%
**Carpentry, plumbing, bricklaying, roofing and similar trades.
***Auto mechanic, machinist.
****Music, economics, social work, electrical engineering and others.

Question 7a: *Do you personally know anyone who received vocational training in agriculture or business in a Frederick County high school?*

Total			Sex		Age			Children in School		Education		
Phone	Personal		Men	Women	Under 40	40's	50 & Over	Yes	No	Less than 12 years	12 years	More than 12 years
26%	(17%)	Yes	32%	23%	28%	34%	18%	30%	22%	14%	31%	33%
74	(83)	No	68	77	72	66	82	70	78	86	69	67
100%	(100%)	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Question 7b: *What did they think of it?* (Asked of those who knew someone who had received such training.)

21%	(15%)	Favorable opinion	22%	20%	23%	25%	15%	23%	18%	11%	25%	25%
2	(2)	Unfavorable opinion	5	1	4	3	*	4	1	*	3	5
3	(-)	No opinion/Don't know	5	2	1	6	3	3	3	3	3	3
26%	(17%)	Total	32%	23%	28%	34%	18%	30%	22%	14%	31%	33%

Question 7c: *What kind of job did they prepare for?* (Asked of those who knew someone who had received such training.)

13%	(5%)	Agriculture	17%	10%	15%	15%	9%	14%	11%	8%	15%	15%
10	(7)	Business	9	10	9	14	8	11	9	5	13	11
1	(-)	Both	2	1	2	*	*	2	*	-	1	3
2	(5)	Don't know	4	2	2	5	1	3	2	1	2	4
26%	(17%)	Total	32%	23%	28%	34%	18%	30%	22%	14%	31%	33%
(500)	(59)	Base: Number of Interviews	(185)	(315)	(209)	(116)	(175)	(241)	(259)	(159)	(204)	(137)

*Less than 0.5%

Question 9a: *There is a lot of discussion these days about how far the public school system should go in preparing students for jobs. Do you think the public schools should offer special vocational training in agriculture, business, or technical skills for those who want it, in addition to basic education for everyone?*

Total			Sex		Age			Children in School		Education		
Phone	Personal		Men	Women	Under 40	40's	50 & Over	Yes	No	Less than 12 years	12 years	More than 12 years
88%	(93%)	Yes	85%	89%	92%	86%	83%	89%	86%	84%	89%	89%
8	(2)	No	11	7	5	11	10	8	8	9	7	8
4	(5)	Don't know	4	4	3	3	7	3	6	7	4	3
100%	(100%)	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Question 9b: *Well, should vocational training like that be available only in the student's own high school, or should there also be a vocational-technical center with specialized classes and facilities that would draw eleventh and twelfth grade students from anywhere in the County for one or two days a week?* (Asked of those who thought public schools should offer such special vocational training.)

		Student's school										
18%	(17%)	only	19%	17%	20%	17%	15%	17%	18%	14%	24%	13%
62	(74)	Vo-Tech center also	58	64	68	62	54	67	57	57	60	69
8	(2)	Don't know/No answer	8	8	4	7	14	5	11	13	5	7
88%	(93%)	Total	85%	89%	92%	86%	83%	89%	86%	84%	89%	89%
		Base: Number of										
(500)	(59)	Interviews	(185)	(315)	(209)	(116)	(175)	(241)	(259)	(159)	(204)	(137)

Question 10a: *Do you believe that job planning is the concern only of the student and his family, or do you believe that schools should also take an active part in planning each child's education toward a job?*

Total			Sex		Age			Children in School		Education		
Phone	Personal		Men	Women	Under 40	40's	50 & Over	Yes	No	Less than 12 years	12 years	More than 12 years
		Student and family										
21%	(12%)	only	22%	20%	21%	22%	21%	21%	21%	24%	19%	20%
72	(83)	Schools also	71	73	77	72	67	75	70	64	76	77
7	(5)	Don't know	7	7	2	6	12	4	9	12	5	3
100%	(100%)	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Question 10b: *At what age or grade should schools begin providing students with information about jobs?* (Asked of those who thought schools should take an active part.)

13%	(25%)	7th grade	11%	15%	13%	15%	13%	13%	14%	11%	14%	15%
25	(24)	8th or 9th	25	24	28	22	22	27	23	23	24	27
20	(13)	10th	22	19	23	23	15	24	16	16	23	21
10	(19)	11th	10	10	10	9	11	9	11	9	12	9
1	(2)	12th	1	1	1	-	1	1	1	2	-	1
3	(-)	Don't know	2	4	2	3	5	1	5	3	3	4
72%	(83%)	Total	71%	73%	77%	72%	67%	75%	70%	64%	76%	77%
		Base: Number of										
(500)	(59)	Interviews	(185)	(315)	(209)	(116)	(175)	(241)	(259)	(159)	(204)	(137)

Question 10c: *Do you believe that job information and preparation should be based only on the child's interest and ability, or should schools take into account the jobs available in advising the student on what to prepare for?* (Asked of those who thought schools should take an active part.)

Total			Sex		Age			Children in School		Education		
Phone	Personal		Men	Women	Under 40	40's	50 & Over	Yes	No	Less than 12 years	12 years	More than 12 years
21%	(46%)	Interest and ability only.	23%	20%	24%	15%	22%	22%	21%	23%	25%	15%
46	(30)	Consider jobs available	45	46	51	50	36	49	42	35	46	57
5	(7)	Don't know/Not sure	3	7	2	7	9	4	7	6	5	5
72%	(83%)	Total	71%	73%	77%	72%	67%	75%	70%	64%	76%	77%

Question 10d: *Should schools consider only jobs available within the County or should it prepare students for all good jobs available, even if it means the graduates will have to leave the County or the State to get them?* (Asked of those who thought job situation should be taken into account.)

3%	(7%)	Within County only	5%	2%	5%	3%	1%	4%	2%	5%	2%	3%
41	(23)	All jobs available	39	42	44	46	34	43	39	27	43	53
2	(-)	Don't know/Not sure	1	2	2	1	1	2	1	3	1	1
46%	(30%)	Total	45%	46%	51%	50%	36%	49%	42%	35%	46%	57%

Question 10e: *Should the school system also attempt to place its graduates in jobs?* (Asked of those who thought job situation should be taken into account.)

52%	(61%)	Yes	51%	54%	57%	48%	51%	53%	53%	51%	53%	55%
17	(17)	No	19	15	19	21	11	20	13	12	19	18
3	(5)	Don't know/Not sure	1	4	1	3	5	2	4	1	4	4
72%	(83%)	Total	71%	73%	77%	72%	67%	75%	70%	64%	76%	77%
(500)	(59)	Base: Number of Interviews	(185)	(315)	(209)	(116)	(175)	(241)	(259)	(159)	(204)	(137)

Question 11: *Do you think it's a good idea for Frederick County schools to offer evening programs for adults to improve job skills or learn new skills?*

Total			Sex		Age			Children in School		Education		
Phone	Personal		Men	Women	Under 40	40's	50 & Over	Yes	No	Less than 12 years	12 years	More than 12 years
95%	(94%)	Yes	93%	96%	98%	93%	94%	98%	93%	93%	98%	94%
3	(3)	No	5	2	2	3	3	2	4	3	1	5
2	(3)	Don't know/Not sure	2	2	-	4	3	*	3	4	1	1
100%	(100%	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Question 12: *In some places, the schools initiate special vocational programs in order to attract industry. Do you think the Frederick County schools should do this, or not?*

50%	(66%)	Yes	57%	46%	49%	56%	47%	49%	51%	58%	50%	42%
33	(17)	No	32	33	37	33	27	36	29	20	33	47
17	(17)	Don't know/Not sure	11	21	14	11	26	15	20	22	17	11
100%	(100%)	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
		Base: Number of										
(500)	(59)	Interviews	(185)	(315)	(209)	(116)	(175)	(241)	(259)	(159)	(204)	(137)

***Less than 0.5%**

Question 13: *Now about your own education. As you look back, do you feel your school gave you as much information as you needed at that time to help you choose a vocation?*

Total			Sex		Age			Children in School		Education		
Phone	Personal		Men	Women	Under 40	40's	50 & Over	Yes	No	Less than 12 years	12 years	More than 12 years
47%	(46%)	Yes	46%	48%	46%	47%	49%	51%	45%	49%	50%	43%
49	(52)	No	51	48	52	47	46	46	51	45	47	55
4	(2)	Don't know/Not sure	3	4	2	6	5	3	4	6	3	2
100%	(100%)	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Question 14: *Did you get as much job preparation as you wanted while you were in school?*

39%	(22%)	Yes	41%	38%	44%	39%	32%	42%	36%	23%	44%	50%
57	(75)	No	56	57	55	53	62	55	59	71	53	47
4	(3)	Don't know/Not sure	3	5	1	8	6	3	5	6	3	3
100%	(100%)	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Question 15: *Was that in the Frederick County public schools or some other?*

57%	(61%)	Frederick County	58%	56%	57%	57%	57%	54%	59%	71%	62%	32%
41	(39)	Other	40	42	40	43	42	44	39	26	36	67
2	(-)	Both	2	2	3	-	1	2	2	3	2	1
100%	(100%)	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Question 16: *How far did you, yourself, go in school?*

11%	(13%)	Grade school only	13%	10%	1%	8%	25%	5%	16%	35%	-	-
21	(53)	Some high school	24	19	19	21	23	20	22	65	-	-
41	(32)	High school graduate, business or trade school	30	46	46	47	30	50	33	-	100%	-
10	(2)	Some college	12	9	12	8	8	10	10	-	-	36%
17	(-)	College graduate	21	16	22	16	14	15	19	-	-	64
100%	(100%)	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
(500)	(59)	Base: Number of Interviews	(185)	(315)	(209)	(116)	(175)	(241)	(259)	(159)	(204)	(137)

Question 17a: *Those are all my questions about the County. Now, I need some information about the household. Do you have any children in any school, kindergarten through high school, now?*

Total			Sex		Age			Children in School		Education		
Phone	Personal		Men	Women	Under 40	40's	50 & Over	Yes	No	Less than 12 years	12 years	More than 12 years
48%	(98%)	Yes	45%	50%	65%	72%	13%	100%	-	38%	58%	45%
52	(2)	No	55	50	35	28	87	-	100%	62	42	55
100%	(100%)	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Question 17b: *Does anyone in the household attend Frederick Community College?*

4%	(2%)	Yes	4%	5%	3%	8%	3%	6%	3%	3%	4%	7%
96	(98)	No	96	95	97	92	97	94	97	97	96	93
100%	(100%)	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Question 17c: *How many are there in the family altogether, living at this address?*

10%	(-)	One person	5%	13%	3%	3%	24%	1%	19%	12%	9%	11%
27	(-)	Two people	32	24	14	18	48	3	49	30	23	28
21	(10%)	Three	21	20	26	22	14	20	21	19	24	18
19	(22)	Four	20	18	27	19	8	33	6	18	20	18
12	(26)	Five	13	12	19	16	1	23	2	10	13	14
6	(15)	Six	4	7	7	9	3	10	2	5	6	6
5	(27)	Seven or more	5	6	4	13	2	10	1	6	5	5
100%	(100%)	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Question 17d: *And are you yourself in your.....?*

18%	(26%)	*20's*	18%	18%	43%	-	-	16%	21%	10%	24%	19%
24	(51)	*30's*	22	25	57	-	-	41	7	16	24	33
23	(12)	*40's*	26	22	-	100%	-	34	13	21	27	20
16	(7)	*50's*	19	14	-	-	46%	8	23	22	15	11
12	(2)	*60's*	10	13	-	-	35	1	23	20	7	10
7	(2)	*Older*	5	8	-	-	19	-	13	11	3	7
100%	(100%)	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
		Base: Number of										
(500)	(59)	Interviews	(185)	(315)	(209)	(116)	(175)	(241)	(259)	(159)	(204)	(137)

TIME BEGUN:_____ INTERVIEW NUMBER_____

Sidney Hollander Associates 2500 Maryland Ave. Baltimore, Md. 21218 467-8565 #3622

Good evening. I'm Mrs.....of Sidney Hollander Associates. We're making a survey in Frederick County to get people's opinions. I'd like to speak to either the man of the house or the lady of the house.

1a. Do you think the County is growing too fast, not fast enough, or do you like the way it's growing as it is?

-1 ☐ TOO FAST -2 ☐ NOT FAST ENOUGH -3 ☐ WAY IT IS -9 ☐ DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE 4-

b. Well, about industry in Frederick County. Do you think Frederick County is becoming too industrial, or do you think we should try to get more industry?

-1 ☐ TOO INDUSTRIAL -2 ☐ TRY TO GET MORE -3 ☐ ALL RIGHT AS IS -9 ☐ DON'T KNOW NOT SURE

[RECORD VOLUNTEERED COMMENTS:]_____ 5-

_____

c. And what about new housing for people who work around Washington? Do you think the County should encourage that kind of residential development, or not?

-1 ☐ SHOULD ENCOURAGE -2 ☐ NOT ENCOURAGE -9 ☐ DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE 6-

[RECORD VOLUNTEERED COMMENTS:]_____

_____

2. Now I'm going to mention some types of County expenditures and I'd like to know whether you feel Frederick County spends too much, not enough, or about the right amount on each of them. [RECORD SPONTANEOUS COMMENTS]

	TOO MUCH -1	NOT ENOUGH -2	ABOUT RIGHT AMOUNT -4	DON'T KNOW/ NOT SURE -3	
a. The first is public health--do you feel the County spends too much, not enough, or about the right amount on public health?..... 7-	☐	☐	☐	☐	7-
b. The next is the Public Library--..... 8- [REPEAT CATEGORIES AS NECESSARY]	☐	☐	☐	☐	8-
c. What about welfare?..... 9-	☐	☐	☐	☐	9-
d. County roads?.....10-	☐	☐	☐	☐	10-
e. and public education?.....11-	☐	☐	☐	☐	11-

3. About how much per year do you think it costs the school system to educate a high school student in Frederick County, on the average? (Just a rough estimate.)

$_____ -9 ☐ DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE 12-

Here are some of the things the County school system spends money for. Please tell me whether you feel the County should spend more on any of these things.

	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW/ NOT SURE	
The first one is athletic teams and faciilities. Do you think the County should spend more money on that?	-1	-2	-9	13-
What about providing more teachers so as to have smaller classes--(do you think the County should spend more money on that?	-1 ☐	☐	☐	14-
And special education for the handicapped?	-1 ☐	☐	☐	15-
What about school buildings and classroom equipment?	-1 ☐	☐	☐	16-
And offering a wider variety of courses?	-1 ☐	☐	☐	17-
And more types of vocational and technical education?	-1 ☐	☐	☐	18-
What about more job counseling?	-1 ☐	☐	☐	19-
What about expanding the Community College?	-1 ☐	☐	☐	20-

Do you think the Frederick Community College should be primarily a way for students to enter a four-year college, or primarily a means of training for a career?

-1 ☐ PRIMARILY FOR COLLEGE -2 ☐ PRIMARILY FOR CAREER -3 ☐ BOTH -9 ☐ DON'T KNOW/ NOT SURE 21-

6a. Do you personally know anyone who has attended the Frederick Community College?

☐ YES [CONTINUE] -9 ☐ NO [SKIP TO QUESTION 7] 22-

b. Did they go to the Community College to get into a four-year college, or to take a vocational, technical or occupational program?

-1 ☐ TO ENTER COLLEGE -2 ☐ VO-TECH-OCC -3 ☐ BOTH/NEITHER/DON'T KNOW

c. What did they think of it?

_____ 23-

_____

_____

_____

7a. Do you personally know anyone who received vocational training in agriculture or business in a Frederick County high school?

☐ YES [CONTINUE] -9 ☐ NO [SKIP TO QUESTION 8]

b. What did they think of it?

_____ 24-

_____

_____

_____

c What kind of job did they prepare for?_____ 25-

8a. Do you personally know anyone who received any <u>other</u> kind of vocational training in a Frederick County high school?

☐ YES [CONTINUE] -9 NO [SKIP TO QUESTION 9]

b. What did they think of it?

_____ 26-

_____

_____

_____

c. What kind of job did they prepare for?_____ 27-

9a. There is a lot of discussion these days about how far the public school system should go in preparing students for jobs. Do you think the public schools should offer special vocational training in agriculture, business, or technical skills for those who want it, in addition to basic education for everyone?

☐ YES [CONTINUE] -0 ☐ NO
-9 ☐ DON'T KNOW/ NOT SURE } [SKIP TO QUESTION 10] 28-

b. Well, should vocational training like that be available only in the student's own high school, or should there also be a vocational-technical center with specialized classes and facilities that would draw eleventh and twelfth grade students from anywhere in the County for one or two days a week?

-1 ☐ ONLY IN STUDENT'S SCHOOL -2 ☐ ALSO VOC-TECH CENTER -3 ☐ DON'T KNOW/ NOT SURE 29-

10a. Do you believe that job planning is the concern only of the student and his family, or do you believe that schools should also take an active part in planning each child's education toward a job?

☐ SCHOOL SHOULD TAKE AN ACTIVE PART [CONTINUE]
-0 ☐ ONLY STUDENT AND FAMILY
-9 ☐ DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE } [RECORD COMMENTS AND SKIP TO QUES. 11]

[RECORD VOLUNTEERED COMMENTS:]_____

_____

b. At what age or grade should schools begin providing students with information about jobs?

AGE:_____ [OR] GRADE:_____ 30-

c. Do you believe that job information and preparation should be based only on the child's interest and ability, or should schools take into account the jobs available in advising the student on what to prepare for?

-0 ☐ ONLY INTEREST AND ABILITY [SKIP TO QUESTION 10e.]
☐ TAKE INTO ACCOUNT JOB SITUATION [CONTINUE]
-9 ☐ DON'T KNOW/ NOT SURE [SKIP TO QUES.10e]

d. Should schools consider only jobs available within the County or should it prepare students for all good jobs available, even if it means the graduates will have to leave the County or the State to get them?

-1 ☐ ONLY JOBS WITHIN THE COUNTY -2 ☐ ALL JOBS AVAILABLE -3 ☐ DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE 31-

e. Should the school system also attempt to place its graduates in jobs?

-1 ☐ YES -2 ☐ NO -9 ☐ DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE 32-

11. Do you think it's a good idea for Frederick County schools to offer evening programs for adults to improve job skills or learn new skills?

-1 ☐ YES -2 ☐ NO -9 ☐ DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE 33-

12. In some places, the schools initiate special vocational programs in order to attract industry. Do you think the Frederick County schools should do this, or not?

-1 ☐ YES, THEY SHOULD -2 ☐ NO, SHOULD NOT -9 ☐ DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE 34-

13. Now about your own education. As you look back, do you feel your school gave you as much information as you needed at that time to help you choose a vocation?

-1 ☐ YES -2 ☐ NO -9 ☐ DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE 35-

14 Did you get as much job preparation as you wanted while you were in school?

-1 ☐ YES -2 ☐ NO -9 ☐ DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE 36-

15. Was that in the Frederick County public schools or some other?

-1 ☐ FREDERICK COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS -2 ☐ OTHER -3 ☐ BOTH 37-

How far did you, yourself, go in school?

-1 ☐ GRADE SCHOOL OR LESS -3 ☐ HIGH SCHOOL -5 ☐ COLLEGE GRADUATE OR MORE

-2 ☐ SOME HIGH SCHOOL -4 ☐ SOME COLLEGE -6 ☐ BUSINESS, TRADE SCHOOL 38-

Those are all my questions about the County. Now, I need some information about the household. Do you have any children in any school, kindergarten through high school, now?

-1 ☐ YES -2 ☐ NO 39-

Does anyone in the household attend Frederick Community College?

-1 ☐ YES -2 ☐ NO 40-

How many are there in the family altogether, living at this address?

☐ ONE ☐ TWO ☐ THREE ☐ FOUR ☐ FIVE ☐ SIX ☐ SEVEN OR MORE 41-

And are you yourself in your ☐ 20's, ☐ 30's, ☐ 40's, ☐ 50's,

☐ 60's, or ☐ older than that? 42-

Thank you. RESPONDENT IS: -1 ☐ MAN -2 ☐ WOMAN 43-

[VERIFY NAME AND DETERMINE ADDRESS]

NAME_____ TIME ENDED:_____

ADDRESS_____ INTERVIEWER_____

_____ ZIP_____ DATE_____

PHONE NUMBER_____ VERIFIED BY_____

DATE_____

APPENDIX E

A STUDY OF

CAREER GUIDANCE

IN MARYLAND

BY

MARYLAND STATE ADVISORY COUNCIL

ON

VOCATIONAL TECHNICAL EDUCATION

September, 1972

64/65

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PURPOSE AND METHODS	1
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	1
STUDENT NEEDS ASSESSMENT SURVEY	3
SURVEY OF PUBLIC ATTITUDES TOWARD VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN FREDERICK COUNTY	4
INTERVIEWS WITH COUNTY SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS	5
INTERVIEWS WITH HEADS OF COUNSELOR EDUCATION PROGRAMS	7
CAREER DEVELOPMENT AND GUIDANCE PRACTICES IN MARYLAND	9
ANALYSIS OF NEEDS	9
Program Objectives	10
Personnel Skills	11
Recommendations	12
SUMMARY	15
APPENDIX	16
BIBLIOGRAPHY	21

66/67

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report was developed by the Guidance and Counseling Committee of the Maryland State Advisory Council on Vocational Technical Education.

Committee Members:

J. Donn Aiken, Chairman

Harts M. Brown, Chairman

Kermit Cottman

Edwin Legg

James A. McComas, Jr.

James G. Nelson

William A. Welch, Sr.

The Council pays special tribute to the work of Dr. Nancy Davis, who was employed as a consultant to the Guidance and Counseling Committee. Dr. Davis is responsible for most of the research and of the writing of the report.

The Council is also appreciative of the assistance from Mr. Neil Carey, Maryland State Department of Education, and Dr. Kenneth Hoyt, University of Maryland, for their assistance in developing the study.

The Council is also grateful to those County Superintendents of Education, counselor educators, and other professionals who participated in the study.

PURPOSE AND METHOD

Interest in providing career education and guidance in the public schools has steadily increased since the passage of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 (Public Law 90-576). The Maryland Advisory Council on Vocational and Technical Education, who have sponsored and published this paper, was created following the passage of this bill in order to evaluate vocational programs, services and activities in Maryland and to make recommendations as to improvement of these programs.

This report deals specifically with vocational guidance in the public schools, grades kindergarten through twelve. Its preparation involved gathering data from a variety of sources in order to gain an in-depth picture of the present status of vocational guidance, as well as the attitudes and opinions of educators, students and the general public in this area. Specifically, data was gathered through interviews with county school superintendents, heads of counselor education programs, adults in Frederick County, and through a needs assessment survey of junior and senior high school students in Maryland. Further information was gathered through a review of the current literature focusing on vocational guidance as well as through a survey of Maryland programs in career guidance (1968-1972) and studies done in other states.

Summaries of the findings in each of the above-mentioned areas follows, concluded by an analysis of program objectives in career guidance and recommendations as to improving current programs.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The passage of the Vocational Education Amendments in 1968 appears to have spurred current interest in providing vocational guidance in the school system (Bottoms and O'Kelley, 1971). Research revealed some school systems to have implemented career development programs which include all students, from kindergarten through the twelfth grade (Miller, 1968; Roman and Doenges, 1971). Career

development was reported to be one function of high school counselors, although only a minority of most counselor's time was found to be spent in career development counseling (Phillips, 1971). In a 1968 General Report, the National Advisory Committee on Vocational Education concluded that less than 50 per cent of the high schools provide vocational guidance in any form to their students. Some of the reasons that many students were found to receive inadequate vocational guidance included: lack of time and/or appropriate training on the part of the counselor (Holt, 1970), the finding that many counselors work primarily with middle class, college-bound students while neglecting the lower class student -- disadvantaged students are a problem for the counselor who typically has little training to work with this group (Graff, Gorrell and MacLean, 1971; Mahoney, 1970), lack of adequate vocational information on the part of the schools to present to students (Towne, 1970), and the overburdening of counselors with remedial and other non-counselor duties (Stevenson and Sandlin, 1970).

Counselor training was found to be a primary reason that counselors were both unprepared and often uninterested in career counseling (Swain, 1971). It was also noted that state certification requirements for counselors seldom require courses in vocational counseling (and Maryland is one of those states that does not), a factor which contributes to poor counselor training in this area (counselor training curriculums are often based on state certification requirements).

A number of diverse programs have been designed and often implemented by the public schools across the nation in an effort to improve career guidance. These programs often include one or more of the following: (1) utilization of existing community agencies and creation of new ones (HEW, 1971; Page, 1971); (2) more relevant use of testing (Loudermilk and DiMinico, 1969); (Tarrier, 1971); (3) creation of specialized jobs for support personnel (Martin, 1970; Page, 1971); (4) development of more meaningful and relevant counselor training (Swain, 1971); (5) institution of placement services in the schools (Gambino and Briant, 1969; Wehrwein, 1970);

(6) employment of audio-visual and automated materials (Harris, 1970; Roberts, 1970); and (7) creation of special programs to assist the handicapped and disadvantaged student (Miller, 1968).

The use of support personnel trained in fields other than education was found to be a practice gaining greater acceptance among educators (APGA, 1968; Matson, 1971). A variety of training programs were reported and proposed for these personnel, at the college level as well as in business and industry. The discovery that differential staffing enabled school systems to provide increased services in career guidance without increased cost was one advantage given for employing this method. Support personnel were found to be particularly useful in the areas of testing, data gathering, giving information, and performing clerical duties.

STUDENT NEEDS ASSESSMENT SURVEY

As a means of assessing student needs in career guidance, 7,871 Maryland junior and senior high school students filled out a 30-item survey questionnaire which asked them to describe themselves and their need for career counseling. Results indicated that 60.2 per cent of the students indicated a present need for career counseling. When asked to indicate the type of help that they most needed, the results were as follows:

%	Type Help
19.5	High school course selection
18.3	Jobs or occupations after high school
18.0	College or college plans
14.2	Tests that will help me with my career plans and decisions
5.6	Personal problems
19.9	No help needed at this time
6.8	Other

A related question asking students to indicate the specific type of help needed in career planning was answered as follows:

%	Type Help
25.3	Training requirements
3.6	Salaries and pay scales
3.3	Work and social roles
4.9	Job skills and behaviors
7.4	Job trends and opportunities
24.3	All of the above
21.9	No help needed at this time
6.7	Other

The majority of students participating in this survey indicated a present need for career counseling. Their needs are varied, an indication that school guidance programs need to provide information, counseling and additional services in a variety of related areas. With this survey in mind, school officials should take a critical look at their career guidance programs to determine if they are capable of filling student needs in this area.

In summary, the research review indicated that counselors, for the most part, do little vocational counseling. However, many innovative programs (for example, programs in Baltimore City, Washington County and Prince George's County) are now being established in an effort to improve the quality and quantity of career counseling offered in the public school systems of the State of Maryland.

Survey of Public Attitudes Toward Vocational Technical Education in Frederick County

The above-named study was recently (June, 1972) completed for the Frederick County Vocation Technical Advisory Council and the Maryland Advisory Council on Vocational and Technical Education. Five hundred and fifty-nine male

and female heads of households participated by answering a set of standardized questions. Many of the questions asked were relevant to this study of vocational guidance and are summarized to provide an indication of public opinion in this area.

More than 70 per cent of the adults participating in this study indicated that they believed the "schools should take an active part in planning each child's education toward a job". The eighth or ninth grade was designated by about half as the point at which schools should begin providing students with vocational information. Of the 90 per cent who believed the school should be active in career guidance, two-thirds believed that career information and preparation should take into account job availability as well as the interest and aptitudes of each student. Over half of the participants also indicated that they would like to see the school system place its graduates in jobs. When asked if they would like to see the county school system spend greater amounts of money on job counseling, over half indicated affirmatively.

In summary, the majority of adults in this survey think career guidance is the job of the school and should be started in the middle school or junior high school. They support their belief in career guidance by indicating their desire to see more money spent on job counseling.

Furthermore, they would like to see career information become relevant as well as see job placement provided by the school system. It appears, therefore, that this sample of adults indicates that the public desires vocational guidance provided in the public schools and would like to see programs in this area expanded.

Interviews With County School Superintendents

Interviews were conducted with superintendents of the eight county school systems* in order to determine current practices, policies and needs in vocational guidance. (Interview results can be found in Appendix A).

---

*Washington, Allegany, Queen Anne, Somerset, Kent, Caroline, Talbot, and Prince George's.

Results indicated that all superintendents saw vocational guidance as a responsibility of the school system. Half of the eight systems reported having a person responsible on a system-wide basis for vocational guidance; three of these four systems assigned additional duties to this person, with only one system having an individual responsible for vocational guidance as his only duty. Two systems reported having a specialist in career counseling in each high school, with a third system having a career counseling specialist in two high schools. Only one system had this type of specialized counselor in the middle schools, and none in the elementary school. Three of the five systems having vocational technical centers reported assigning counselors with specialized functions related to career guidance.

All superintendents indicated their high schools' counselors have vocational counseling duties; five of the superintendents also assigned junior high counselors this function. (No elementary school counselors were assigned this function.) Four counties assigned counselors in their vocational technical centers, career counseling duties.

Over half of the superintendents indicated they saw a need for counselor specialization in college counseling, counseling for vocational students, job development and placement. One superintendent reported mixed feelings about this question, with the remaining superintendents indicating that they believed counselors should be able to perform any type of function required of school counselors. Five systems reported hiring specialized and general counselors. Two superintendents commented that lack of funds hindered their ability to employ counselors with specialized functions.

A variety of replies were obtained from the question, "What kinds of preparation and experiences would you like to see persons involved in vocational guidance have?" These included: vocationally related coursework, work experience work internships and group counseling coursework. These superintendents also reported that they would like to see counselor certification requirements changed to permit

entry of non-educators with work experience into vocational guidance, to require vocational experience by counselors, and to require that counselors take more than one course in the area of career guidance.

Six of the eight superintendents also indicated that they believe that state boards of education should establish state-wide policy concerning responsibility in providing students with vocational counseling. Suggestions as to the other services in regard to vocational aspects of guidance that should be provided students included administration of the General Aptitude Test Battery to all students, establishment of a computerized information service, assignment of special counselors to work with underachievers, increased school and student interaction with industry and with state and federal agencies.

Interviews with superintendents made apparent the differing levels of importance accorded vocational guidance in Maryland school systems. It follows that the manner in which these educators viewed vocational guidance affects the quality and quantity of vocational guidance provided in their school systems. Many progressive suggestions were noted from these interviews and were considered in formulating the recommendations.

Interviews With Heads of Counselor Education Programs

Since the review of the research revealed counselor training to be generally inadequate in the area of vocational guidance, a survey of six counselor education programs in the State of Maryland and the District of Columbia was conducted in order to ascertain the number and types of courses in the area of vocational counseling now being offered, or being planned. Further information was gathered concerning the views of counselor educators toward vocational counseling and toward the role of differential staffing in career counseling.

All schools surveyed offered one required course in the area of career guidance with the course usually built around vocational theory and/or location and

cataloging of occupational information. Several program directors indicated interest in implementing additional courses in career counseling including courses taught as seminars, and those which would utilize field experiences.

The counselor educators were not in agreement as to the desirability of using differential staffing when training was gained in fields other than that of counselor education. (The American Personnel and Guidance Association have recognized the value of differential staffing and published guidelines for their use: Support Personnel for the Counselor - Their Technical and Nontechnical Role and Preparation.)

This disagreement appears to be centered around the question of the role of the counselor, i.e., should counselors be trained to perform all duties now required of a school counselor or should they specialize in their training and performance of duties. This disagreement was also noted in the interview of the superintendents. It appears that the way in which the counselor educators and superintendents view the role of the counselor has played, and will play, a major role in the manner in which vocational counseling will develop. Specifically, this question affects counselor certification requirements, counselor education programs and hiring and assignment of counselors to school systems. The manner in which counselor educators perceived a counselor's function appeared to be related to their planning of additional courses in vocational counseling, i.e., those who saw counselors as specialists were planning more courses.

The counselor educators did agree that the use of support personnel could ease counselor loads and enable student services to be improved. The University of Maryland and the State Department of Education are now involved in a program which trains paraprofessional guidance workers for Annapolis Senior High School. One of the functions of these individuals is in the area of career development and includes working with career advisers, developing and maintaining career information, helping students to use this information, and helping students to make career inquiries.

Several educators indicated they would like to see more specialization of counselor roles with a program which would train a career counselor curriculum specialist. A need for specialized internships was also expressed. It was apparent, however, that although counselor educators indicated vocational counseling to be one role of the school counselor, no school seemed to be adequately preparing its graduates to fill this role at this time.

Career Development and Guidance Practices in Maryland

Wide variations have been noted in the manner in which State school systems have recognized the importance of career development and began to provide services to students in this area. There are indications, however, that a variety of progressive programs in career development are being implemented throughout the State, including the use of a computer and placement programs in Baltimore City and the Washington County career counseling program.

The majority of the school systems are now providing some career development activities in the elementary grades. Over half of the systems now offer courses or units in the secondary schools on occupational information, the world of work or career exploration. Seventeen of the 24 systems presently use standardized test instruments related to career development. Eleven systems reported operating job placement programs (this is a drop of three from 1968).

This report presented evidence that many Maryland school systems are moving forward in their presentation of career development. The wide variations in the recognition of the importance of career guidance and implementation of programs in this area indicates, however, that the schools have a long way to go in developing a uniformly effective vocational guidance program throughout the State.

Analysis of Needs

The importance of providing vocational guidance in the schools is gaining increasing recognition among educators, both national and local. A review of the

research focusing on vocational guidance revealed both increased awareness of the need for vocational guidance in the schools, as well as the establishment of a variety of programs to fill this need. As previously noted, State supervisors and counselor educators expressed the belief that vocational guidance was one function of the school counselor. Programs of career development are being provided throughout the State on a limited basis. However, in order to provide comprehensive career development services to all public school students in the State, it is important to identify the needs. These needs are identified as program objectives and personnel skills. The recommendations of the Advisory Council are provided for suggesting ways of meeting the career counseling needs of the students.

Program Objectives

1. Career Information

   Occupational information -- broad and specific.

   Regional job availability and competencies needed to perform these jobs.

   How to make career decisions.

   Specific job-related skills

   - How to interview for a job.
   - How to fill out employment applications and resumes.
   - How to look for a job.
   - How to keep a job.

2. Self-Exploration

   Information on skills, aptitudes and interests.

   Vocational counseling.

3. Additional Services

   Placement and Follow-up.

Personnel Skills

A variety of experiences and training are required of the counselor and other personnel who provide career development services to students. Those professionals who are designated to assist a student in gaining occupational information should have training in the following areas: career psychology, occupational information specifically related to national, state and local needs, and the world of work (how to help students acquire specific skills related to finding and keeping a job). Actual work experience outside the field of education should be required.

It should be noted that many of the needs of students for vocational information could be competently handled by trained personnel from fields such as business and industry.

The task of keeping up with employment trends would seem to be a full-time job. This job could be filled by someone whose duties included, not only employment needs, requirements and trends in the State, but dissemination of the information to the students, perhaps through the use of a computer. This individual would need leadership ability as well as skill in the planning and evaluation of programs.

Personnel assisting students in self-exploration should have training in administering and interpreting interest and aptitude tests. Here again, trained instructional aides could effectively schedule, administer and score students tests. Counselors, trained in test interpretation and vocational counseling, could then counsel with each student about their tests and vocational future.

The competencies required of the individual serving as the placement specialist would include work experience as well as training in effective placement procedures. This specialist would be sure that each student had learned specific job-related skills such as job interviewing, and filling out employment applications. (The use of video tape, together with role-playing by students, has been found to be an extremely effective method of teaching job interview skills.)

Recommendations

After taking into consideration information gathered from the variety of sources previously reviewed in this report, as well as the needs which an effective career development program must fill, the following recommendations are being offered:

1. Provide greater funding for personnel in the area of career development, guidance, counseling and placement.

2. Develop and maintain a State-wide occupational data system available to all school systems.

3. Change the certification requirements so that counselors are required to have taken more than one course in the vocational area; courses which focus on practical application of career counseling techniques and regional occupational information should be stressed. Certification could also be changed to allow counselor certification in specialty areas with work experience required for certification in some specialty areas.

4. Recognize by certification, support personnel trained in areas other than education as eligible to work in the school system.

5. Counselor education programs, particularly in the larger schools, should be encouraged to establish a major in career guidance, with appropriate courses provided, such as:

   Techniques of career counseling.

   Planning and managing career guidance and placement programs.

   Occupational information from the standpoint of national, state and local needs.

   Career needs of special populations such as disadvantaged and handicapped students.

   Testing -- specifically related to career tests.

   Practicums and internships in career counseling.

Each counselor education program should evaluate the course(s) in career counseling now being offered in terms of relevancy and usefulness to the school counselor. The course(s) should then be changed, if necessary, with other appropriate courses (using the above list as a reference) added to the program.

6. Training programs should be offered in the schools (on-the-job training as is being carried out at Annapolis High School), and community colleges for support personnel. Areas in which support personnel might be trained are: placement and follow-up; vocational and occupational information; and vocational test administration and scoring.

7. Evaluate present guidance and counseling services now afforded by the school systems, particularly in view of student needs and their views on the services that they want offered. Each system should have a plan for career guidance with clearly stated program objectives.

8. Encourage all school systems to employ an individual responsible only for career development. This person would be responsible for ensuring that vocational guidance is provided in all schools and as effectively as possible.

9. Encourage each system to determine the composition of each school in terms of relative career goals of the students and the educational needs beyond high school. Determine percentage of disadvantaged students -- then assign counselors accordingly. Counselors working with the disadvantaged should have special training in providing career guidance to this group, since disadvantagement affects interpretation of test scores, grades and attitudes toward employment.

10. Provide in-service training in career development for counselors already employed in the school system. If specialization was desired, one counselor from

each school could receive the training. Training should stress practical application of knowledge.

11. Encourage each school system to provide interest and aptitude tests for all secondary level students, as well as meaningful interpretation.

12. Provide placement and follow-up services for all students requesting the service including drop-outs. The most effective placement service would probably be operated on a system-wide basis. In this way the greatest number of job listings would be available for matching with the greatest number of students. Have available, current occupational information for student use (perhaps through computer).

13. Provide counselors and other personnel in a ratio that would allow all students to receive career guidance.

14. Offer a conference on vocational guidance to school superintendents and counselor educators. Use this opportunity to further progressive and positive attitudes toward vocational education. Provide information on state and national programs in this area and allow time for discussion.

15. The State Career Guidance Committee has prepared a program which includes an expenditure of 1.2 million dollars for career counseling beginning in Fiscal Year 1974. This Council recommends that the State Board support this program with recommended full funding.

SUMMARY

The State of Maryland is making progress toward the goal of providing vocational guidance to meet the needs of all students. Recognition of the importance of providing comprehensive career education to all students is steadily increasing. Hopefully, the information and recommendations contained in this report will be used to make vocational guidance in Maryland the best in the nation.

Appendix A

Interviews with Superintendents

Question 1: Is vocational guidance seen as a responsibility of the school system?

	Number	%
Yes	8	100
No	0	-

Comments: "It is recognized that while this is a responsibility of the school system, it is a weak point and total reorganization of the concept must be developed."

Question 2: Do you have a person on a system-wide basis responsible for vocational guidance?

	Number	%
Yes	4	50
No	4	50

Question 3: What other responsibilities does this person have?

All guidance and counseling, pupil personnel, testing placement	3
An assistant superintendent who participates in curriculum planning and administration of work-study program.	1

Question 4: Do you have a specialist in vocational guidance in each of the high schools?

Yes	2	(One has at 2 high schools)
No	6	

Middle or Senior High

Yes	1
No	7

Elementary Schools

Yes	0
No	8

Vocational Technical Center

Yes	3
No	2
N/A	3

Question 5: Do you have counselors at these schools that have career counseling as one of their functions?

High School

Yes	7
No	0

Middle School

Yes	5
No	2

Vocational Technical Center

Yes	4
No	2
N/A	1

Elementary School

Yes	0
No	7

(One superintendent indicated this question was not applicable.)

Question 6: Do you employ specialized counselors?

Yes	5
No	1
No Answer	2

General Counselors

Yes	5
No	0
No Answer	3

Question 7: Do you believe there should be specialization in counseling: Such as

(Of those who answered)

(a) Counseling for college

Yes	5
No	-

(b) Counseling for vocational students

Yes	5
No	-

(c) Job development counselors

Yes	5
No	1

(d) Placement counselors

Yes	4
No	1
Limited	1

Comments: "Mixed feelings. Six years ago would have answered "no", sees a place for specialization today, but would require tripling of guidance staff which is hardly in this system.

If enough available along with funds.

Each of these functions should be a leadership responsibility of a counselor who also does personal counseling with all students who choose to come to him.

(a) Depending upon size of the system and number of individuals preparing for college would govern a full-time individual in this position.

(b) Will be responsible in the vocational technical center.

Question 8: What kinds of preparation and experiences would you like to see persons involved in vocational guidance have?

Number	
1	Courses in occupations, labor market information, etc.
2	Ability to identify and relate to students. Background in career education, psychology of attitude development.
6	Work experience outside education as well as training work release program wherein school system subsidized counselor on the job in local industry.
	Knowledge of employment for handicapped individuals.

Question 9: What changes would you like to see at the University level in counselor preparation?

Comments: Relate preparation to world of work.

Six month internship in a variety of career areas.

2 More work in career education, group counseling techniques.

Less emphasis on college entrance. Work experience before certification. Better rounded courses in all areas of counseling such as labor market information, job duties and assignments.

Question 10: What changes would you like to see in counselor certification?

Comments: Accept college degree plus significant experience in industry or government.

3 Permit entry of non-educators with actual work experience.

Workshop experience in career education.

More than one three-hour course in vocational guidance for counseling certification.

Vocational experience by counselors such as working in industry or related state or county agencies such as vocational rehabilitation or the Maryland State Employment Service.

Question 11: Do you feel the State Board of Education should establish state-wide policy concerning responsibility in providing students with vocational aspects of guidance.

Yes	6
No	2

Comments: Stronger effort to get the right kind of people in the field.

Recommend review of primary standards for the certification of vocational guidance counselors more in keeping with the expertise of individuals capable of doing the job.

Question 12: Are there other services in regard to vocational aspects of guidance you feel should be provided students.

Comments: Vocational guidance counselors should be totally aware of job opportunities in the immediate area.

Relationship of curriculum to job duties to which student aspires.

Ability to communicate realistically to students about course curriculum and job opportunities.

Counselors in elementary and junior high schools.

Counselors assigned to work with under-achievers.

State leadership in upgrading counselors.

Create responsibility of counselors to work with all students.

K-12 curriculum in career education give all students the General Aptitude Test Battery.

Wholesome viewpoint of work concern about attitudes and restoration of work ethic.

Computerized information service.

Increased interaction with industry, state and federal agencies.

Pre-vocational training and screening counseling during training, and placement after training.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bottoms, Gene, and O'Kelley, George L., "Vocational Education as a Developmental Process," American Vocational Journal, 1971, 46:3, 21-24.

Carey, Neil E., "Vocational Guidance for All," American Vocational Journal, April, 1970.

Gambino, Thomas W., and Briant, Robert A., Career Development Job Placement: A Guidebook for Counselors, State of New Jersey, 1969.

Graff, Robert W., Gorrell, William T., and MacLean, Donald G., "Socio-Economic Status and Students' Reactions Toward School Guidance," The High School Counselor, 1971, 54:8, 484-492.

Harris, Edward E., "What's Ahead for D.E.," American Vocational Journal, 1971, 46:1, 53-55.

Holt, Kenneth A., "Vocational Guidance for All -- New Kinds of Personnel Needed," American Vocational Journal, 1970, 45:5, 62.

Loudermilk, Kenneth M., and DiMinico, Gerald, Instruments for Vocational Guidance Selection and Placement: A Review and Synthesis of Research in Idaho, HEW, Washington, D.C., March, 1969.

Mahoney, Harold J., "Information Services," The High School Counselor, 1970, 54:4, 276-286.

Martin, Ann M., "An Interactive Media for Student and Teacher Growth," Audio-visual Instruction, 1970, 15, 53-56.

Matson, Jane E., "Student Personnel Services in Two Year Colleges; A Time for Charting New Direction," Peabody Journal of Education, 1971, 48:4, 276-281.

Miller, C. H., "A Pilot Project for Vocational Guidance in Economically Underdeveloped Areas," Illinois State Office of The Superintendent of Public Instruction, Springfield, 1968.

National Advisory Council on Vocational Education, Counseling and Guidance: A Call for Change, June, 1972, HEW.

"Opinions About Vocational Education in Michigan," A Study by the Michigan Advisory Council on Vocational Education, June, 1971.

Pate, Robert H., "Placement and Follow-up in the Guidance Program," The High School Journal, 1971, 54:4, 287-294.

Phillips, Wallace, "Guidance Services: Range and Scope," The High School Journal, 54:4, 1971, 243-250.

"Public Attitudes Toward Vocational Technical Education in Frederick County," June, 1972.

"A Report on the Practice and Procedures of Career Guidance," March, 1972.

"Report of the Survey of Career Development and Guidance Practices in Maryland Public Schools," Maryland State Department of Education, Division of Research, Evaluation and Information Services.

Roberts, Tommy L., "Total Guidance Information Support System," The Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1971, 49:3, 194-195.

Roman, Robert J., and Doenges, Jama L., "Career Week at McTigue Junior High," American Vocational Journal, 1971, 46:6, 62-63.

Stevenson, William W., and Sandlin, Blan E., Evaluating Guidance Counseling and Placement, Oklahoma State Department of Education, December, 1970.

Support Personnel for the Counselor: Their Technical and Nontechnical Role and Preparation, American Personnel and Guidance Association, Washington, D.C. 1971.

Swain, Emeliza, "A Training Program for Career Exploration Teachers," American Vocational Journal, 1971, 46"8, 81-82.

Swan, Robert J., "Some Thoughts on Career Development," California State College, 1972.

The System Approach: An Emerging Behavioral Model for Vocational Guidance. The Center for Vocational and Technical Education, Ohio State University, 1971.

Tarrier, Randolph B. "Career Counseling: Prediction or Exploration," Paper presented at American Personnel and Guidance Association, New Jersey, April 4-8, 1971.

Towne, Douglas C., "Rural Area Application of Vocational Education Innovations Resulting from Research and Development Programs," Final Report, Office of Education, Bureau of Research. December, 1970.

Vocational Education: Innovations Revolutionize Career Training Education, U.S.A. Special Report, HEW, 1971.

Wehrwein, Austin C., "Work Opportunity Center," The High School Journal, 1970, 53:8, 449-454.